

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1938

AENEIDEA.

i 365-70. Venus, disguised as a Tyrian maiden, concludes her account of the previous history of Dido and of the founding, under this woman's leadership, of Carthage as a colony of refugees from Tyre.

deuenere locos ubi nunc ingentia cernes
moenia surgentemque nouae Karthaginiis
arcem,

367 mercatique solum, facti de nomine Byrsam,
368 taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo.
sed uos qui tandem? quibus aut uenistis ab
oris?

quoque tenetis iter?

Lines 367-8, whatever others may have said about them, appear to me wholly unobjectionable in themselves; adequate, that is, as narrative poetry. But as a climax they are deplorably, they are arrestingly flat; and they are the climax to a thirty-four-line history from the mouth of a god. Or can it be that the professed Tyrian girl is trying to be girlish? Mackail has recently (ed. p. 2) suggested this; there 'may even be a touch of conscious humour' when, on the verge of 'becoming garrulous', she 'pulls herself up and abruptly comes back to the point in the *sed uos qui tandem?* which immediately follows'. If this were so, the playfulness could be made apparent and the anticlimax concealed by punctuating with Ladewig (followed by Jahn) *tergo—sed etc.*; but that test of reality is surely more than this interpretation can survive. It seems to me out of tone with the whole passage and situation.

More than thirty years ago I was told to supply *sunt* with *mercati*, yet I can never remember to do so until I am sent back by the full stop. Every rhetorical instinct makes me await a concluding line. And now at last I have noticed that the line desiderated has been preserved. It provides not only the complement to the sentence and the climax to the relation, for both of which I was consciously groping; to the material of the narrative it supplies a dramatic finale which, I must con-

fess, came to me upon re-perusal as a gift.

deuenere locos ubi nunc ingentia cernes
moenia surgentemque nouae Karthaginiis arcem,
mercatique solum, facti de nomine Byrsam
(taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo),
iura magistratusque legunt sanctumque sena-
tum.

sed uos qui tandem?

Now re-read from 361. These people are fleeing from a tyrant, and their goal is unattained until they have secured not only a site, but a constitution, laws, and judicature; which institutions will of course centre in the Byrsa or citadel. As a student of Homer Virgil knew that monarchies in the heroic age were constitutional. Republics developed out of them; and all his readers knew that the historic Carthage was a republic. Next re-read from 340-1. Only through some such supplement as the above can Venus, or perhaps rather the girl,¹ be made to fulfil her promise *sed summa sequar fastigia rerum*; the story of oppression reaches a hopeful ending; with the traditional text its theme is never completed.

What I have done is, of course, to transfer 426, a line there helplessly and deeply immured in a long account of heavy building operations. Compare for instance Mackail's note there. In poetic texts, when a line fell out, it often rejoined the queue at the bottom of the page, but it remained in its new context only if it happened to provide a colourable fit; otherwise it was probably relegated to the margin and might thus drift still further until some bare foothold offered. Hence (I suppose) these long-distance transpositions, the existence of which, at all events, has by now been sufficiently established. There could be no reason whatever for the poet to jot down 426 in his margin there; but in this place it might very

¹ 'And we have a senate etc.' is possibly still more natural from her, as the concluding information for strangers.

readily have been omitted, because the effacement of a single stroke would have produced homoearchon, IAVR, IVRA.

I submit that this transposition can virtually be proved. Our conclusion fixed the formula for new foundations for the remainder of the poem. See iii 137 and v 758, and observe that in the latter passage Acestes corresponds to Dido, *forum* to *Byrsam*, *patribus* to *senatum*, and *iura* to *iura*. Silius i 24 f. is obviously no bar.

Ribbeck, who, following Beck and Peirlkamp, bracketed 367-8 as left unfinished by the poet, took 426 for spurious.

iv 223-6:

uade, age, nate, uoca zephyros et labere pinnis,
Dardaniumque ducem, Tyria Karthagine qui
nunc

expectat fatisque datas non respicit urbes,
adloquere et celeris defer mea dicta per auras.

Servius glosses *expectat* by *moratur*—the verb which is applied to Aeneas just below, 235; but the equation is simply false, as was shown by Housman in *C.R.* XIX 260 f. His denunciation of *expectat* appears to me unanswerable; and even that is not more fatal than the defence of Page. Aeneas admittedly 'is not waiting for anything or until anything happens'; accordingly Virgil, who had somehow or other got this most inappropriate of all verbs into his text, gave it nothing to govern; and then all was well.

But Housman's *Hesperiam* is surely incredible; not merely because his palaeographical justification is too much of a *tour de force*,¹ but because after 'who now at Carthage', and before 'non illum talem genetrix promisit', rhetoric if not common sense requires something more than the purely negative description 'does not consider his destined future'. We must have the offence on its positive side; this is what the first half of our relative clause professes to give, and so far, I am satisfied, it is true to the poet's intention.² Indeed there is a still stronger argument. Mercury is demonstrably here what he is elsewhere, a faithful messenger; his

tu nunc at 265 corresponds exactly to his master's *qui nunc*; his *heu . . . tuarum* reproduces *fatisque . . . urbes*; and what comes between them (and relates directly to Carthage) is language of stern reproach.

Aeneas is dallying with his royal mistress, hunting, laying foundation stones, and generally enjoying himself; or so, at least, it *might* be argued. I therefore first thought of *cessat* (coll. *teris otia* 271), preceded by an indignant *en*. But this is externally too improbable; while *en, peccat*, my second idea, would introduce a far less Virgilian³ as well as less antithetical term. And I can contrive no third way of meeting Mercury's *uxorius*.

The only alternative is to make the charge more positive still, and roundly tax Aeneas with having settled in Carthage. And this is in fact the substance of Mercury's reproof in the positive part of 265-7. True, the actual terms—*fundamenta locas, pulchram urbem exstruis*—are presumably influenced by the speaker's discovery of the hero in *flagrante delicto*, see 260; but while he may legitimately intensify the indictment he cannot misrepresent it. To extract such a meaning from our passage we shall have to make our verb govern *urbes*; and this construction was already advocated with *expectat* by Jahn and has been revived recently by Mackail. Now, as to their phrase, Aeneas at Carthage is no more awaiting cities or a city than he is awaiting anything or waiting at all—for Housman's general denial, *i.e.*, has my assent.⁴ The only city he ever could 'await' is Rome; but now what has made him temporarily ignore his known destiny is that he has had a city offered to him and has immediately adopted it. See i 572 f. (. . . *pariter* considere . . . *urbem* quam statuo, *uestra est*), 600 (*urbe* domo *socias*), 627; iv 74 f. (*ostentat*, sc. Aeneae, *urbem paratam*), 214 (*dominum* Aenean in *regna recepit*), 374. Aeneas is strictly 'in process of taking over' the city from her at her offer; and the word for this is not *expectat* but *exceptat*. The transference (as between friends) of a

¹ Ostensibly; but who will believe that (to say no more) the text of Virgil ever had *esperiam* in this place?

² Compare *moratur . . . nec respicit* in 235-6.

³ *Cessare* 13 times, *peccare* twice (Wetmore).

⁴ H. does not, as, of course, he need not notice Jahn's construction.

dynasty is described at i 276 in the words 'Romulus *excipiet* gentem'; but Jupiter, who is here determined to stop the process,¹ uses what I take to be properly an inceptive or desiderative form. Virgil is one of the four authors in each of whom this verb is found once; *geo.* iii 274, in the same sense as *captat*² at *geo.* i 376, 'tries to catch or get' ('snuffs' Mackail), a different sense from 'awaits', which denotes pure passivity, but not too far removed from it to have generated at that passage the very corruption which I here assume; *expectat* is the manuscript reading, though it is corrected in M.

But now comes an apparent hitch. Jahn's construction has found hardly an adherent. Housman ignores it; Conington rejects it as harsh, and I am bound to say I regard that as, if anything, an under-statement. The one and only decent way, itself an excellent way, to make us take *urbes* with *exceptat* as well as with *respicit* was to precede *exceptat* by an epithet antithetic to *fatis datas*. The epithet required is *Tyrias*, and all we have to do is to accept this admirable emendation of the modest 'S.W.'—see C.R. II 226. Virgil, who in the *Aeneid* has *Karthago* ten times, nowhere else attaches to it any such otiose ethnicon³; whereas he does use *Tyrii* (i 12) and *Libycae* (iv 348) in proximity to its name. Let it not be said that *Tyria*

makes a good antithesis to *Dardanium*; *Tyrias* makes a much better; moreover the series *Dardanium* . . . *Tyrias* . . . *urbes* is paralleled by *Priamiden* . . . *Graias* . . . *urbes*, iii 295. Nor let it be said that *Tyrias* is too close to *Karthagine*; it is placed first for emphasis. Compare further *Gaetulae urbes* iv 40, *Inachias* . . . *urbes* xi 286; yes, and *urbibus* . . . *Tyriis*, x 54 f.; and look at the context of this last, 44-55. Now Buscaroli well draws attention to the fact that the plural *urbes* of Aeneas' destiny is unique, while *urbem* is frequent; his explanation too is right, that with Lavinium it includes Alba and Rome; cf. 234, 236. Similarly then with *Tyrias*, *urbes* will imply just what it means in the general parallel at x 54. Finally, what one *excipit* or *exceptat* is something specific, '*levis auras*' *geo.* iii 274, 'Arcton', not any wind, *Hor. carm.* II xv 16; indeed, reflection will show that *exceptat* itself practically demands *Tyrias*.

Housman strangely declared that if in place of *expectat* there were a gap, we should fill it with no verb, 'for even *cunctatur* would be inconsistent with *non respicit*'. Indeed it would. As *Tyrias* contrasts with *fatis datas*, so the verb which gives the right antithesis to *respicit*, and the verb which Mercury can legitimately paraphrase by *Karthaginis fundamenta locas* (in antithesis with *rerum tuarum*) and *pulchram exstruis urbem* is *exceptat*, which in blunt English means 'grabs'.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

¹ Dido's death would at this rate leave the sole monarchy to Aeneas and their descendants if any.

² And as *decerpsit* in his model Varro Atacinus.

³ *quasi homini ita ciuitati epitheton patrium dedit*, Schol. Dan. Quite so, it is odd and invites explanation. Can editors adduce one

parallel? They don't; not even Pease, who parallels everything.

A MATTER OF ACCENT.

It is commonly thought that we shall never know how far our Byzantine accentuation of Greek represents classical pronunciation. On one small matter, however, the answer can be given with some confidence.

Where two forms of a personal pronoun exist (as *με* and *ἐμέ*, *μου* and *ἐμοῦ*, *μοι* and *ἐμοί*, and in Ionic *σφι* and *σφίσι*), one of which is enclitic and the other accented, Greek employs the

longer, accented form after prepositions.¹ This preference is due to a certain desire to avoid the retracted accent falling on the preposition. For Herodotus, though he never writes *σύν σφι*, freely admits *σύν δέ σφι* (7 times), where the retracted accent is borne by the particle, not the preposition. From

¹ Eur. *Or.* 736 is now written *κάκιστος ἐς ἐμέ*, not *κάκιστος εἰς μέ*.

this we assume that where there is only one form of the preposition (as *σε*, *σου*, *σοι* and in Ionic *σφεας* and *σφεων*) it must carry an accent when following a preposition; that is, that we must write *πρὸς σέ* and not *πρὸς σε*.

Now it so happens that the usage of Herodotus enables us to prove both this proposition and also another, namely, that in Herodotus *σφεας* and *σφεων* were accented when 'directly' or 'indirectly reflexive', i.e. when referring to the subject of their own or a governing clause, but enclitic when 'anaphoric', i.e. when not referring to such a subject.

The Herodotean usage is this. Anaphoric *σφεας* occurs 205 times and anaphoric *σφεων* 53 times, but never once after a preposition, when *αὐτούς* and *αὐτῶν* are employed instead. Whenever *σφεας* and *σφεων* occur after prepositions—and they do so 13 and 7 times respectively—those pronouns are directly or indirectly reflexive. This phenomenon can have only one explanation: *σφεας* and *σφεων* after prepositions had to be accented (the former of our propositions), and accented *σφέας* and *σφέων* were reflexive and not anaphoric (the second of our propositions).

There are several corollaries.

(1) Herodotus distinguished *σφι* as anaphoric and *σφίσι* as reflexive. For except, as already stated, in the combination *σὺν δέ σφι* he never uses *σφι* after prepositions, and yet *σφίσι* after prepositions is always reflexive.¹

¹ This in refutation of my attempt in *C.Q.* 1933, 214 to confound the usage of *σφι* and *σφίσι*.

We have therefore a means of determining the accent of *σφεας* and *σφεων* when they occur in indirect reflexion otherwise than after a preposition. They are to be written as anaphoric in constructions where *σφι* is universal, and as reflexive in those where *σφίσι* is universal, while in constructions where Herodotus used now *σφι*, now *σφίσι*, we shall decide by tossing a coin.

(2) It is our practice to give enclitic *σφεας* and *σφεων* an accent after paroxytone words. But Herodotus uses them freely after such words with anaphoric force—*σφεας* 56 times and *σφεων* 12 times. The practice therefore cannot correspond to classical pronunciation.

(3) We still cannot decide the vexed question (Jebb on Soph. *O.T.* 1470), whether Attic *σφας* and *σφων* were ever enclitic. If they were avoided after prepositions when anaphoric, they must have been enclitic when anaphoric and accented when directly or indirectly reflexive. But unfortunately in Attic prose *σφας* and *σφων* are used only reflexively, Comedy avoids them altogether, and in Tragedy they are always anaphoric and never found with prepositions (Aeschylus once, Sophocles and Euripides five times each).

The statistics for Herodotus are supported by those for Homer, who has anaphoric *σφεας* and *σφεων* 28 and 4 times respectively, but only once with a preposition and then, as in Herodotus's *σὺν δέ σφι*, a particle intervenes: *ρ 261 περὶ δέ σφεας*.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

University of Sydney.

MATTERS OF SOUND IN GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS.

(I) IN *C.R.* L, 1936, p. 3 it is said that at Aesch. *P.V.* 52 Samuel Butler rejected the order *τῶδε δεσμά* 'because of the juxtaposition -δε δε-', and in *A.J.P.* LVIII, 1937, p. 342 Mr. L. A. Post declares that 'the collocation -δε δε- is very harsh here if the line is read without a pause'. Aeschylus has the following other examples of -δε δε-: *P.V.* 513 *ᾧδε δεσμά*, *Septem* 27 *τοιῶνδε δεσ-*

πότης, *Ag.* 543 *τοῦδε δεσπύσω*, *Cho.* 188 *τῆσδε δεσπύζειν*, *Eum.* 60 *τῶνδε δεσπότη*, 306 *τῶνδε δεσμων*. Sophocles has one example at *Ajax* 299 *τοὺς δέ δεσμίους*, and the following examples occur in the extant plays of Euripides: *Alc.* 145 *οἶδε δεσπότης*, 806 *τῶνδε δεσπότης*, 948 *δὲ δεσπότην*, *Hec.* 724 *τοῦδε δεσπότης*, *H.F.* 28 *τῆνδε δεσπύζων πόλιν*, 1035 *περὶ δέ δεσμά*, *Trö.* 715 *τοῦδε δεσπύσει*,

Hel. 479 δὲ δεσπότης. As Mr. Post makes some fanciful remarks about the effect aimed at and secured by the collocation of δε δε- in Menander, *Ep.* 524 (Coppola) λόγου δὲ δέεται ταῦτα καὶ συμπτώσεως, it may be pointed out that there are collocations of δε δε- in Aesch. *P.V.* 580, *Ag.* 138, *Cho.* 879, *Soph. Ajax* 75, *El.* 1027, *O.T.* 418, *Ant.* 1005, *Phil.* 440, *O.C.* 28, 492, *Eur. Med.* 284, 548, *Heraclidae* 701, *Hipp.* 1032, *Hec.* 92, 383, 1005, *Ion* 843,¹ 1341, *Tro.* 365, 970, *Phoen.* 454, 729, 913, 940, *Bacchae* 505, *I.A.* 1599, Menander, *Ep.* 284, 609. The particle δέ is followed by δὴ twice in Aeschylus, once in Sophocles, and thirty-three times in Euripides.² There are in Greek tragedy about thirty other examples, which cannot be cited here,³ of collocations of δέ (or -δε) and δὴ- (or δὴ), δε- (or δέ); the number would be larger if collocations such as *Ion* 825 δδε δ' ἐνέυσσαςτο were included. There are also some examples of δὴ δει, δὴ δὴ, δει δὴ, and δει δει.

(II) Statius, *Thebais* II. 559-561:

saxum ingens, quod uix plena ceruice gementes
uertere humo murisque ualent inferre iuueni,
rupibus euellit.

¹ ἐκ τῶνδε δέει σε δὴ γυναικεῖον τι δρᾶν.

² More than half these occur in the *Orestes* (10) and *Electra* (7).

³ Menander has *Perik.* 261 δὲ δῆπουθεν, 292 δὲ δηλώσανθ', *Ep.* 297 οὐδὲ δέομαι.

ΑΓΓΑΡΟΣ.

φρυκτὸς δὲ φρυκτὸν δεῖρ' ἀπ' ἀγγάρου πυρὸς
ἐπεμπευ. Aeschylus *Ag.* 282.
ἐὰν δ' ἔχῃ τι μαλακόν, ἀγγαρεύεται.

Menander 440K.

WHILE that was all the metrical evidence, subconscious association with ἀγγελος led to the assumption that the middle vowel of ἀγγαρος was short. But forty-two years ago new evidence from Menander came to light (Demiańczuk's fragments 2, 9, 10):

ἀγγαρος δλεθρος. ἡδέως ἀν μοι δοκῶ . . .
ἀγγαρος ἐντως κούδερὸς προορῶμενος.
ἀγγαροφόρος καὶ ταῦθ' ἂ νῦν ποιεῖς ποιεῖ.

The third of these lines may be scanned with an opening dactyl and then an iamb (compare *Clouds* 225, ἀεροβατῶ . . .); but, if ἀγγαρος is to be saved, the first of them needs δλεθρος, which would be remarkable in comedy, and the second must join the select company of trimeters that begin with choriamb: Ἰππομέδοντος . . . Παρθενοπαῖος . . ., εἰεν ἀκούω . . ., φαιοχίτωνες . . .

Of Baehrens's conjecture *murisque queant*, Klotz observes 'praeter ingratum sonum haud displicet'. But there are parallels at Lucr. I. 586 *quid quaeque queant*, II. 1073 *conicere in loca quaeque queat*, III. 484 *quaecumque queunt conturbari*, V. 545 *quid quaeque queat res* and Val. Fl. I. 831 *lapsumque queat consumere mundum*. Statius writes *obliqua quantum* at *Theb.* VI. 509 and *sequi qui* at VII. 707, and he follows -que by qu- at, for example, I. 706, IV. 184, 337, 451, V. 451, VI. 798, IX. 183, X. 812, XI. 339, XII. 675, *Silu.* II. 1. 195, 2. 140, 6. 98, III. 1. 148, V. 1. 76, 81, 2. 118, 5. 42, *Ach.* I. 54, 730.

(III) At Ammianus Marcellinus XX. 8. 11 Novák, *Wiener Studien*, XXXIII, 1911, p. 314 rejects the reading *nobis-que* *qui* in favour of his own *nobiscum*, and at XVI. 11. 12 he urges a return to *residuum quod*, on the ground that Ammianus does not use -que immediately before the relative. That may be so; but the reason is not, as Novák suggests, a consideration of sound, for compare XXV. 2. 7 *consultique quid astri species portenderet noua* and 10. 3 *quarum ortus obitusque, quibus sint temporibus praestituti, humanis mentibus ignorari*.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

But why should we fight shy of ἀγγαρος? It will make up for the loss of *angina*.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

PLATO, *PHAEDO* 92C/D.

'Αλλ' ὅρα πότερον αἰρῇ τῶν λόγων, τὴν μάθησιν ἀνάμνησιν εἶναι ἢ ψυχὴν ἁρμονίαν;

Ποῦδ μᾶλλον, ἔφη, ἐκείνου, ὃ Σώκρατες. ὅδε μὲν γάρ μοι γέγονεν ἀνευ ἀποδείξεως μετὰ εἰκότος τυνὸς καὶ εὐπρεπείας. ὅθεν καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς δοκεῖ ἀνθρώποις (sic codd. cum Stob.).

FOUR interpretations are offered.

(i) Jowett (cf. Archer-Hind, Apelt, etc.): 'and it is therefore believed by the many.' This is what the Greek as we have it must mean, but there would be no point in making Simmias say anything so wildly untrue.

(ii) Fowler: 'which is the reason why many men hold it.' To get this we should, of course, have to cut out τοῖς, and even so we should be

left with an untrue statement such as Simmias would not naturally make.

(iii) Burnet: 'τοὺς πολλοὺς . . . ἀνθρώπους, "most people" who do hold it.' Even if we deleted ἀνθρώπους, this could hardly be got out of the Greek.

(iv) Cary (cf. Cope, Robin, etc.): 'whence most men derive their opinions.' This is acceptable as regards sense, but δοκεῖ ἀνθρώπους surely cannot mean 'men hold (their) opinions.'

I suggest that we should read δοκεῖ <δ δοκεῖ>, 'men hold the opinions they hold.' The form of expression is common and the corruption assumed natural. Cf. *Rep.* 342e καὶ λέγει δ λέγει καὶ ποιεῖ δ ποιεῖ ἀπαντα (om. δ ποιεῖ Bekkeri q).

W. L. LORIMER.

University College, Dundee.

PLATO, *POLITICUS* 278D/E.

Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὸτ' ἦδη θεὸς ὁ κοσμήσας αὐτὸν, καθορῶν ἐν ἀπορίας ὄντα, κηδόμενος ἵνα μὴ χειμασθεῖς ὑπὸ παραχῆς διαλυθεῖς εἰς τὸν τῆς ἀνομοιότητος ἀπειρον ὄντα πόντον δὴν, πάλιν ἐφεδρος αὐτοῦ τῶν πηδάλιων γιγνόμενος, τὰ νοσήσαντα καὶ λυθέντα ἐν τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν προτέρᾳ περιῶδῃ στρέψας, κοσμεῖ τε καὶ ἐπανορθῶν ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν καὶ ἀγήρων ἀπεργάζεται.

πόντον *Simpl. Phys.* 1122, 11 Diels, Procl.

Tim. i. 179, 26 al. Diehl.

τόπον *Platonis libri*, Eus. *P.E.* xi, p. 562c.

THOUGH πόντον is certainly the true reading, it seems worth pointing out that τόπον has more authority than is cited for it in Burnet or even Diels. Not only is it attested by Plotinus, *Enn.* i. 8, 13 ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀνομοιότητος τόπῳ (cf. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work*, p. 396 n.) but it is also supported by a loose citation or paraphrase in Athanasius, *De Incarn.* 43: Πλάτων φησὶν ὅτι ὁρῶν τὸν κόσμον ὁ γεννήσας αὐτὸν χειμαζόμενον καὶ κυδυνεύοντα εἰς τὸν τῆς ἀνομοιότητος δίνειν τόπον, καθίσας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὁλακας τῆς ψυχῆς, βοηθεῖ καὶ πάντα τὰ πταίσματα διορθοῦται. There seems no need to suppose that Athanasius is reproducing Plato at second hand from the *Praep. Evang.*, for in the *Contra Gentes*, of which the *De Incarn.* is a continuation, there is at least one reference to a Platonic passage (*Rf. init.*) not quoted in the *P.E.*: ὁ Πλάτων εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾷ μετὰ Σωκράτους κατέρχεται, τὴν ἀνθρώπου τέχνην πλασθεῖσαν Ἀρτεμιν προσκυνήσαν (*C. Gent.* 10 *fin.*). This appears to be taken from Origen, *C. Cels.* vi p. 631 οἱ τοιαῦτα περὶ τοῦ πρώτου γράψαντες καταβαλόνουσιν εἰς Πειραιᾶ, προσευξόμενοι ὡς θεῷ τῇ Ἀρτέμει.

W. L. LORIMER.

University College, Dundee.

ON MARTIAL VI, LXI. 3.

Laudat, amat, cantat nostros mea Roma libellos
meque sinus omnes, me manus omnis habet.

Ecce rubet quidam, pallet, stupet, oscitat, odit.

Hoc volo; nunc nobis carmina nostra placent.

IN vs. 3 *oscitat* is dissonant from its fellows without the saving grace of being thereby humorous. From early times until after Mar-

tial's day,¹ and elsewhere in Martial's own verse,² this word and its congeners (as we should inevitably have inferred even without evidence) suggest fatigue, ennui, negligence, wandering attention,—attitudes which Martial is insisting did not afflict his readers; they blushed, or grew pale, or were struck dumb, or felt hatred, but they were not bored.

Is it not possible that Martial wrote *os fricat*?

O. J. TODD.

University of British Columbia.

¹ E.g., Ter. *Andr.* 181 (*interoscitantis*); Auct. ad Her. iv, 48; Lucret. iii, 1065; Cic. *Mil.* 56 (*pransi, poti, oscitantis ducis*); fragm. orat. *Pro Q. Gallio* (vi ed. Müll.), 1 (*partim ex vino vacillantis, partim hesternae ex potatione oscitantis*); Brut. 200 (*videt oscitantem iudicem, loquentem cum altero, nonnumquam etiam circulantem*, all signs that the advocate has failed to get the attention of his jury), 277; Pers. *Sat.* iii, 59; Aul. Gell. IV, xx, 8 (. . . *qui . . . in iure stans clare nimis et sonore oscitavit, . . . tamquam illud indicium esset vagi animi et alucinantis et fluxae atque aptae securitatis*).

² II, vi, 2-4:

lectis vix tibi paginis duabus
spectas eschatocollion, Severe,
et longas trahis oscitationes.

XI, xcvi, 20 f.:

febricitantem basiabit et flentem,
dabit oscitant basium natantique.

FISH IN TIBER.

HARKING back to my own and other notes on Juvenal V. 104 in last *C.R.* (LII. 115-19), let me add a word about the passage in Galen which has been cited in the case. It occurs in the tract on Food-fishes (part of the *De alim. fac.*) which, edited by Coray, is bound up with his edition of Xenocrates (Paris, 1814). Here Galen discusses the effect of foul water upon fish, and tells how the worst fish of all are to be found κατὰ τὰς ἐμβολὰς τῶν ποταμῶν, ὅσοι κοπρῶνας καθαίρουσιν. Even the Muraena, which never comes up the river at all, is at its worst near such a river's mouth, καίτοι γ' οὐτε ποταμοῖς ἐπεμβαίνουσάν ἐστιν εὐρεῖν αὐτήν, οὐτ' ἐν λίμνῃ γεννωμένην, ἀλλ' ὅμως καὶ αὕτη χειρίστη γίνεται κατὰ τὰς ἐμβολὰς τῶν τοιούτων ποταμῶν, ὅποῦς ἐστιν ὁ διὰ Ῥώμης βέων. Fish from the river are a very different thing to those from the sea, and one fights shy of buying them: καλοῦσι δ' αὐτοὺς ἐνιοὶ Τιβερίνους, ὡς ἰδίαν ἐχοντας ἰδέαν οὐδενὶ τῶν θαλασσιῶν ὁμοίαν. The passage reads like, and for aught I know is, a commentary on Juvenal! One thing is clear to me, that Τιβερίνους is by no means 'proprium nomen piscis'; it is a term of contempt and depreciation for any fish that the river may contain.

If we now turn to Xenocrates (vi, p. 2), we find him talking of the poor quality of freshwater fish, to which rule there are certain notable exceptions; for some few are not a whit better than the fishes of the sea: ὦν τινες οὐκ ἀποδέονται τῆς θαλασσίας ὁλῆς, such as the ἐν Ῥήνῳ πέρερ, καὶ ἐν Τιβέρι λάβρα, ἡ δὲ ἐστὶν ἐπεστυγμένος.

This latter is precisely Pliny's *lupus piscis in Tiberi amne*, and Columella's *lupus fluviialis*, in its spotted variety but no longer with any stigma of inferiority.

On the next page Xenocrates speaks of *γλαῦκος καὶ λάβραξ*, *ταυτε γὰρ πάντα αὐτῷ*. Now *γλαῦκος* is an extremely difficult fish-name (cf. Mair's Oppian, p. lxi), and more fish than one seem to be confused or included under it. Here the word is a conjecture of Coray's, plausible

because *γλαῦκος* and *λάβραξ* are elsewhere associated; but the MSS give *γλάνος* and *γλάκος*. The very thing we want (though I hardly dare suggest it) is a fish called *γλάκος*, very similar to the *λάβραξ* *ὅς ἐστιν ἐπεστιγμένος* in the Tiber:

aut glacus aspersus maculis Tiberinus. . .

But the trouble is that there is no word of its inferiority.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

REVIEWS

A COMPANION TO CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

Sir Paul HARVEY: *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*. Pp. xii+468; 16 plates with figures and maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

'THE aim of this book, as designed by the publishers, is to present, in convenient form, information which the ordinary reader, not only of the literatures of Greece and Rome, but also of that large proportion of modern European literature which teems with classical allusions, may find useful.' The book is similar in scope and plan to the German work of Lamer, noticed in C.R. XLVIII. 37, but with a stronger emphasis on literature.

It is a first-rate book. Sir Paul Harvey has done his work with a nice sense of proportion, accuracy, economy of words, and felicity. The classical student in schools and universities will find it a reliable guide (cross-references are numerous and judicious) to all the authors in his curriculum, and the reader of English literature is reminded throughout of its close contacts with Greece and Rome—of Pindaric enthusiasms, of the dealings of Shelley and Landor with Sophocles, even of the ancestry of 'I do not love thee, Dr Fell.' At Chaeronea the lure of the lion is quite rightly resisted, and Milton introduced instead. The character of the briefer entries may be illustrated by two specimens. 'Pelion, a wooded mountain near the coast of Thessaly. Otus (q.v.) and Ephialtes, according to Greek mythology, heaped it on Ossa and Ossa on Olympus, in their attempt to overthrow the gods. About it lived the

centaurs.' What more need be said? 'Clausula, in Latin rhetoric, the closing words of a period. The rhythm of the *clausulae* in Cicero's speeches has been carefully studied and it has been found that the majority of his *clausulae* conform to a definite type, in which a cretic (— —) or sometimes a molossus (— — —) is followed by two or more syllables trochaic or cretic in their rhythm. Thus:

Non habemus — — — — —
Cessit audaciae — — — — —
(In)commodo civitatis — — — — —

Quintilian (X. 2. 18) says that an orator thinks it a capital imitation of the style of Cicero to close a period with "esse videatur." This is a variety of the above in which two short syllables are substituted for the second long of the cretic — — — — —. Quid plura? The authors, their works, the main characters of history and legend, social and economic 'background,' geography and a host of terms belonging to the vocabulary of literary and linguistic scholarship are dealt with in similar fashion, and there are general articles (listed on p. ix) on such topics as the Alphabet, Classic, Magic, Maps, Metre and what not. The volume closes with a date-chart of classical literature, tables of weights and measures, figures and maps. Classical examiners are likely to become familiar with many of Sir Paul Harvey's entries, and if examinees catch from him his technique of crisp and pertinent annotation it will be all to the good.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

HUMANISM IN GERMANY

Horst RÜDIGER: *Wesen und Wandlung des Humanismus*. Pp. 316. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1937. Boards.

THE scope of this work would be more clearly conveyed if the words 'in Deutschland' were added to the title: for of the nine representatives of humanism discussed in it only three, Cicero, Petrarch, and Erasmus, are not German, and even in dealing with these three the author has his eye chiefly on their relation to German culture. But this limitation makes the book more instructive, for it gives an insight into the influence of humanism in Germany which few in this country possess.

The author's method is to study his subject in typical representatives. Cicero appears first, for the idea of humanism, i.e. for his purpose a culture ('Bildung') modelled in part on ideas derived from an earlier civilization, appears first among the later Romans, of whom Cicero is the natural representative. The account of humanism in Cicero is clear and interesting, but the attempt to account for his influence on philosophical and theological grounds seems superfluous, for there is no other Latin author who furnishes such material for the humanist. And there is a curious statement here, to which the author recurs later in the book: that Cicero's idea of Nature was derived not from wild nature, but from the civilized landscape of the Campagna. It is more than doubtful whether *natura* as a philosophical term would suggest to Cicero, any more than *φύσις* to Aristotle, a landscape of any kind.

In the next chapter the author is chiefly concerned to show that there was no humanism in the Middle Ages, since such study of the Classics as existed was directed to the service of the Church. The humanism of the early Renaissance, here represented by Petrarch, was, we are told, too much Romanized by its origin in Italy, and too much concerned with the direct imitation of classical models, to be fruitful in that form in Germany.

Ulrich von Hutten, the author thinks, saw this and sought to adapt it to German needs, but he was before his time. The study of the Classics, though introduced, remained for long alien and unfruitful. Martin Opitz marks the next stage. He succeeded in rendering the German language, hitherto regarded as vulgar, an adequate vehicle for dignified expression, especially in poetry; but his contribution is merely to language, not to ideas, and he is followed by a period in which French influence is supreme. Winckelmann at last breaks through the Italian and French tradition, which regards the Classics, and especially the Romans, chiefly as models of style. Going back to the Greeks he discovered in them a source of ideas, and arrived through them at a genuinely humanistic and pagan philosophy of life—Erasmus, we gather in the chapter devoted to him, had in spite of his talents been too Christian to be altogether a humanist. Winckelmann's concern however is with Art, and it was left for later writers to apply his ideas to other subjects. W. von Humboldt accordingly expands them into that ideal of humanism as the all-round development of man's powers which was of wide influence in the nineteenth century. His weakness is that his theories are based on an idealized picture of Greece, which did not survive scientific scrutiny. The next writer mentioned, Jacob Burckhardt, repairs that defect, for his ideas are based on wide knowledge and in themselves stimulating and acute; but they were not adequate to maintain the claims of humanism in a world increasingly materialistic. By about 1900 humanism as based on the Classics appeared, we gather, to be moribund in Germany. It has since been revived by what is here called the 'Third Humanism'. It differs from the earlier forms by making the Greek conception of *Paideia* the central point of its teaching, by welcoming the aid of 'Philologie' more than before, and (a significant difference) by acknowledging the importance of the State.

In this brief survey it is impossible

to discuss, or even to indicate, some of the most interesting ideas suggested by the book. To the English reader perhaps the most obvious point of interest is the contrasts and likenesses which it suggests between the history of humanism in England and in Germany. To the student of the Classics it is on the whole reassuring, for it illustrates the tenacity of classical studies and their Protean adaptability to varying conditions.

It may further be noted that the author's interest in humanism is mainly practical and, so to speak, sociological. He seeks from it rules for the guidance of life, public and private, and has little to say of its influence on art or philosophy. He does so partly because he is convinced, as others of his countrymen have been, that there is a special affinity between the spirit of Germany and that of ancient Greece.

F. R. EARP.

STUDIES IN HUMANISM.

J. W. MACKAIL, O.M.: *Studies in Humanism*. Pp. viii+271. London: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

Francis P. DONNELLY, S.J.: *Literature, the Leading Educator*. Pp. xv+278. New York and Toronto: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, \$3.

BOTH these volumes consist of essays and addresses on various subjects, but while Father Donnelly's deal mainly with the Classics, only a small number of Dr. Mackail's do so directly. Of these the first, 'What is the good of Greek?', originally delivered as a lecture at Melbourne, is admirable. It has the writer's persuasive charm of style and effectively condenses into fifteen pages without apparent effort the main arguments for Greek. It would be hard to find a more convincing statement of the case, and it is worth mentioning that I have tried it on an obstinate sceptic with excellent results. 'A Lesson on an Ode of Horace', a reprint of an address to teachers, is, as one expects, interesting and suggestive, but one or two points may seem to some over-subtle. It is difficult to prove that *aurae* in line 11 of Odes I. 5 is more than 'breeze,' or the like; and however faultless the colour-sense of the poets referred to on p. 66, it would be rash to wager on the colour of hair intended by Horace in *flavam religas comam*. For Latin is woefully meagre in words for colour and the poet must use the words he has.

'The Italy of Virgil and Dante' makes the interesting point, often overlooked, that Italian, as opposed to Roman, patriotism was a late growth, and due in no small measure to these

two poets. This point is enforced by a wealth of illustrations from literature and history such as few have at their command. They remind us that the writer is one of the most distinguished representatives of the Humanism from which the title of his volume is taken, and it is interesting to notice his definition of humanistic studies. They are, he says (p. 45), 'the studies which are not concerned, or are not concerned directly, with the laws and processes of the physical world, but with life, thought, and conduct, with human nature as it is, or it has been, and as it may become.' It will be seen that Dr. Mackail takes a wider view of the nature of Humanism than did the author of *Wesen und Wandlung des Humanismus*; and accordingly he does not, as Dr. Rüdiger does, regard Erasmus as an inchoate Humanist. His introduction to a reprint of the Tudor translation of Erasmus' treatise on war will be useful even to those who know the original Latin version, to which he rightly refers us. It is perhaps not quite so unfamiliar as he suggests, but it should be better known and has a topical interest.

A lecture on Bentley's Milton contains much that is of great interest to any reader of Milton, for Dr. Mackail's knowledge, of the Italian poets in particular, enables him to clear up points which puzzled Bentley; but to the student of Classics the whole episode is one on which he does not care to dwell, except as a warning. 'Non ragionam di lor'. The rest of the book hardly concerns us here, but is all interesting, and in particular the admirable studies

of Ariosto and of 'Pilgrim's Progress'. On the last line of p. 72 'Gabellians' should be 'Sabellians', and in the citation on p. 115 a 'more' has somehow crept in in place of 'less'. And on p. 114 the reference to More's *Utopia*, as it stands, would lead the incautious reader to suppose that More himself wrote in English.

Father Donnelly's book presents points of likeness and of unlikeness to Dr. Mackail's, the chief being that, though he is an equally stout defender of the Classics, his methods and his grounds for the defence of the Classics are very different. The volume, as the author admits, contains some repetition, for the subjects of the essays and addresses here printed overlap in part. Nearly all of them deal directly or indirectly with the Classics, several with particular points, e.g. the Homeric simile, but more striking, because more unfamiliar, are those which deal with the aims and methods of classical education. Here the writer's view is so old-fashioned as to seem startlingly novel. For he believes that the first, and most logical, reason for studying great writers is to learn how to write. 'Does a carpenter', he pertinently asks on p. 125, 'take his saw to give a lecture on steel or does he take it to saw?' And later on the same page he says: 'Language is an instrument for use; it is a power; it is a habit; it is an art and should produce its kind'. (Here and elsewhere he uses 'habit' in the scholastic sense.) Consistently with this he insists elsewhere that composition in prose and verse is the most vital part of classical education.

This view is old-fashioned indeed, but worth considering for more reasons than one. For one thing it was the view of the ancients themselves, a point which should carry some weight with students of the Classics. Further it is a fact that Classics, as now taught, do not always produce even in good scholars the power to write good English. Opponents of the Classics, e.g. Mr. H. G. Wells, are fond of rubbing that in. It is true likewise that some

teachers of Classics at both schools and universities are rather like the supposed carpenter who takes his saw to lecture on steel, and spend their time imparting irrelevant information. That defect has been pointed out before, and is mentioned in somewhat different terms by Dr. Mackail in his lecture on Horace. The mistake of applying to Classics the methods appropriate to science, to which Father Donnelly rightly attributes this defect, is probably more widespread in America, but it is not absent here, and Father Donnelly's outspoken criticism, repeated in various forms in this work, should be a useful corrective. Besides this the writer has interesting things to say on the general principles of education, and some practical suggestions for reform, but the latter relate chiefly to Transatlantic conditions. His criticisms of these are trenchant and sometimes amusing, and reveal a very curious state of affairs.

Of the essays on particular subjects several deal with ancient oratory, of which the writer has evidently made a special study, one deals with 'The Tragic Element in Sophocles' Oedipus the King', and two with Homer. That on Homeric Litotes contains interesting points, but more valuable is that on the Homeric Simile. Here he maintains that in its essence Homer's simile is a story, and his arguments in defence of that thesis show insight. One of his points is that Homer conceives the scene described in the simile as a whole and that the 'irrelevant' details are part of the whole. They only become conscious elaborations in his later imitators. One or two of the essays do not concern us here, but we may notice one which is, or should be, germane to classical studies, an interesting discussion of Jacques Maritain's 'Art and Scholasticism'. If it tempts the reader to go on to Maritain himself, he will not find it a waste of time.

The book is clearly printed, but not free from misprints, e.g.: 'Hissaric' for Hissarlic on p. 27 (foot-note); *teneram* for *tenueram* on p. 52; and on p. 55 *antenantiosis* was too much for the printer.

F. R. EARP.

IN HONOUR OF EDWARD CAPPS.

Classical Studies presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday.

Pp. xii + 389; plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

THIS volume contains forty-three articles ranging over the whole field of Altertumswissenschaft. The following deal with linguistic or literary topics. J. T. Allen comments on Aristoph. *Vesp.* 511: the ἐν Ἑλλάδι of the Suidas and Hesychius glosses on λοπάδι should be ἐν ἐλάαι (with Koraes), and λίθος should be τύλος. S. E. Bassett holds that in Aristotle *Poet.* 1459b 15 (ἡ δὲ Ὀδύσσεια . . . ἠθικόν) ἠθικόν refers not to ἦθη but to ἦθος, which is the missing 'part' of the plot in 55b 32. The epic is ἠθικόν not because it is a comedy of manners but because it is an 'ethical tragedy' with a happy ending, satisfying τὸ φιλόθρονον. W. N. Bates bases on the *Ichneutai* some speculation on the function of the chorus in the other Satyr plays of Sophocles. C. Bonner defends Brunck's *παρθένον* in *Soph. Ant.* 1237, taking ὑγρόν to mean 'tenderly clasping.' C. D. Buck holds that even if θάλασσα has the old-Aegean ending (it may equally well be a Greek word out of *θαλαχία or *θαλαγchia: cf. δάλαγχαν· θάλασσαν in Hesychius), the adoption by the Greeks of an Aegean word for 'sea' does not prove a continental habitat. The Norsemen, Anglo-Saxons, Irish and Letts have also dropped the 'inherited' word for the sea. P. R. Coleman-Norton gives statistics of the words for 'fortune'—*euentus*, *fors*, *casus* and *fortuna*—in Roman drama, with a list of the adjectives applied to *fortuna* and a discussion of the chief conceptions of fortune furnished by the dramatists. H. L. Crosby examines Attic Comedy and Oratory of the fifth century in order to estimate the amount of historical knowledge the average Athenian was presumed to possess (under Oratory he includes the speeches in Thucydides). He concludes that 'only the vaguest conception of the facts is presupposed.' G. E. Duckworth discusses the use made of the 'servus currens' in Roman Comedy. T. Frank examines Horace's

controversies with the New Poets and suspects that he was 'the chief protagonist of the new classicists of the Augustan period.' F. R. B. Godolphin writes on the treatment of love in Stesichorus. C. B. Gulick discusses omissions in Athenaeus and comments on various passages. H. L. Jones, writing on the beacon signals in the *Agamemnon*, points out that Athos and Makistos are intervisible, and would be even if they were 189 miles apart (they are actually separated by 110 miles). He adds that distances up to 190 miles have been read by heliotrope or electric lamp in different parts of the world, and concludes that the geographical argument for a lacuna at *Agam.* 287 fails. (See *C.R.* XXXVI. 155.) (On this it may be noted that a *θωμός ἐρείκης* is not a heliotrope, and that the question at issue is not one of maximum visibility but of maximum reliability of communication, using the lowest possible number of stations, in average atmospheric conditions. The only ancient beacon-chain of which record survives fixes this at sixty miles, over a country in which intervisible stations at double this distance were available.) I. M. Linforth argues that the notice of Orpheus in *Diod.* IV. 25 is derived from Herodorus of Heraclea. W. J. Oates claims that the 'mean' is the key principle in Horace's philosophy—he uses the 'mean' not only as an image but, in the Aristotelian tradition, as a dynamic principle. W. A. Oldfather discusses Catullus 45, 8-9 in the light of Pease's paper in *Class. Phil.* VI. 429 ff. and of other evidence, and shows that not all sneezes were lucky. La Rue Van Hook takes *λιπαρός* as applied to Athens to combine the ideas of 'shining' and 'splendid.' Finally it may be noted that F. J. de Waele's treatment of *ὀρθογράφων τὸν ἄριστον ἐνὶ στρατιῇσι φανέντα* in a Corinthian epitaph is not happy: the reference is clearly to an army clerk. Nor is *προικοφαχία* on a Christian coffin-lid from Corinth likely to be a reproach or imprecation over the bones of an unsatisfactory husband (*προικοφάγας*). I should rather see a reference to the

πρόοικος of Anatolian epitaphs, followed by a name in abbreviation—e.g. προ-
(ο)ίκο(ν) Φ(λασίον) Ἀχα(ιωῖ).

Historians, archaeologists, epigraphists and others will find much valuable

matter in the remainder of the volume, which is worthy of its occasion.

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

OUTLINES OF GREEK LITERATURE.

Nicola TERZAGHI: *Lineamenti di storia della letteratura greca*. Pp. vii+292. Turin etc.: Paravia, 1938. Paper, L. 15.

TERZAGHI ends his history with the sixth century A.D. and adds a short epilogue on the parts played by Egypt and Byzantium in the transmission of Greek literature. In his preface he explains that his book is intended for the Italian 'Licèi classici', and must therefore not be expected to contain anything profound. It seems rather a pity that he has decided against giving any bibliography or references, since these are often the most valuable portion of such books as this, at least to the genuine student who is not content with the parrot-knowledge to which they all too easily lend themselves. Terzaghi's avowed aim has been to dwell on ideas rather than names or dates, and to avoid mentioning authors whom the students, unless they specialize later in classical philology, will never meet again. But it would seem that his standard of values and power of selection succumbed too frequently to the mass of material which confronts the historian of Greek literature. His book is well crammed with names; in places new ones are produced at the rate of half-a-dozen and more per page, so that either no room is left for ideas (as in the six lines assigned to the *Περὶ ὕψους*) or else they appear in indigestible tabloid form (as in the sections devoted to philosophy). Elsewhere, however, Terzaghi shows real ability in describing the literary and historical ensemble of a given period, and writes with disarming enthusiasm on the authors with whom he is really familiar. He would have given himself scope to write a much more attractive book if he could have brought himself to omit Prodicus of Phocaea, Ananius, Moeris, Coluthus and many more. For where will the non-specialist

meet these again? Or if he meets them will he recognize them the better for having read the brief mention which each receives here? I should hesitate to suggest additions; but it is at least arguable that the student is more likely to hear of Maximus of Tyre or Demetrius (*Περὶ ἐρμηνείας*) or Stobaeus, all of whom are omitted, than of Pherecydes of Syros or Cornutus or many others who are here included. Terzaghi has an admirable sense of the continuity of literary development; but he does not illustrate or substantiate his views on the 'evolution' (a word of which he is perhaps too fond) of the various 'literary kinds' (e.g. choral lyric, which, he thinks, developed from monodic; or the dialogue, on which he has scarcely anything to say). He could have written a book which would have been genuine history throughout; my chief criticism is that the present work too frequently degenerates into a chronicle which will find its chief use—thanks to a good index—as a work of reference.

The information given is in the main reliable. A certain amount of loose statement is perhaps inevitable in a book of this kind, and it would be ungracious to list fully inaccuracies such as the implication that tragedy was acted only at the Great Dionysia, or the statement that Crates initiated the allegorical treatment of Homer. There are also many highly speculative statements, e.g. that the theatres at Cnossus and Phaestus had something to do with the origin of tragedy; or that the alleged lowly origin of Euripides is the 'profound reason' why he is so different from Aeschylus and Sophocles; or that what Plato taught in the Academy was as 'poetic' as the tone of some of his dialogues. Terzaghi's views, even when unsubstantiated, will often command sympathy; but I think it a pity to tell students (in the face of

the evidence) that Aristotle's *κάθαρσις* means an educative process whereby the spectators learn to avoid the errors, and consequent misfortunes, into which the tragic heroes have fallen. Another

somewhat antiquated feature is his confident belief that satyrs were goats and that tragedy gets its name from the satyr-chorus.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE NEW OXFORD TEXT OF AESCHYLUS.

Aeschyli septem quae supersunt tragoediae. Recensuit Gilbertus MURRAY. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

PROFESSOR MURRAY has now replaced Sidgwick's Aeschylus in the Oxford series by an edition which exhibits adequately and concisely the whole basis of the text, and for that reason first his edition will be welcome. But it is also the text of one already well-known as translator of his author, and presents explicitly many interesting suggestions which a translation could only imply.

Professor Murray treats his mss. with as much respect as they can possibly deserve, and with due regard to their relative merits (occasionally perhaps the inferior mss. get less than justice, e.g. *P.V.* 343, *Ag.* 79), and in emending scarcely goes beyond the principles stated in the preface. The apparatus is handier than Hermann's or Wilamowitz's and fuller than any other, thanks to the use of the symbol Φ , wherever possible, for readings prevalent in Wilamowitz's Φ mss.: this procedure, if bold, need not mislead and gets rid of much lumber. With the apparatus are included a selection of conjectures (among them, apart from the editor's, many new to texts of Aeschylus) and some explanatory notes. There seem to be few major inaccuracies,¹ but some conjectures ascribed to contemporary scholars are really much older: e.g. at *Suppl.* 179, 638,

Eum. 769 Pauw and Heath anticipated Radermacher and Lobel. At *Pers.* 163 Professor Murray's $\Pi\acute{o}\tau\mu\omicron\varsigma$ was suggested in *C.R.* XLVIII (Lawson). And, while we miss notes at a few places (*Suppl.* 87, to defend $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta\rho\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma = \epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$, surely improbable in the context: *Pers.* 914), some notes, such as *Ag.* 527n., 817n., seem unnecessary. *Ag.* 1148n. adduces a scholiast whose note is not obviously relevant to the text of that tormented line.

It is one thing to present and estimate the evidence for Aeschylus' text, another to produce a text which is approximately Aeschylean; and here Professor Murray occasionally raises doubts, seeming sometimes to take either too conservative or too individual a view of what his author might have said; very often his conservatism and his ingenuity coincide, as in his repunctuations and redivisions, which perhaps rarely upset the a-priori probability that there are few opportunities left for such methods. Moreover, while few will dare to impugn the principle that Aeschylus' language, not being fully known to us, doubtless contained forms we should not expect (though $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha$, $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\tau\omicron$, really an emendation, $\tau\acute{o}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$ in *Suppl.* 905, *Ag.* 779, *Cho.* 664 seem, even so, unlikely), and though, where no convincing emendation has been suggested, it may be necessary to print a doubtful text, there are also passages where apparently well-established emendations are discarded in favour of manuscript readings, e.g. *Ag.* 649, 1268, 457, *Cho.* 448: in the first two the Euripidean parallels are different in tone and context, and in none is it easy to see that the need for emendation has disappeared. One may doubt also now and then whether the best available conjecture has been chosen: thus at *Ag.* 474 Valckenaer's $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\iota\mu\iota$ has strangely survived Her-

¹ In the text *Theb.* 1002-3 have been accidentally inverted: *Pers.* 1035 read, presumably, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\eta$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\eta$. In the notes, at *Pers.* 111 the mss. are not quoted, though they differ from the text: *Pers.* 63n. read 'Herm. 17' (not 27); *Ag.* 527n. read '*Pers.* 811' (not 511); 'paragraphus' has slipped into the masculine in some half-dozen places (*Suppl.* 336, 507, 741; *Theb.* 407, 875; *Cho.* 780). There are several other less troublesome misprints.

mann's 'invenustissime', and Keck's optatives *Ag.* 1338-40 give a curiously academic tone to the Chorus's reflections. A different point arises at *Ag.* 1041, where F's *δουλίας μάξης βία* is adopted; a better parallel than *νόμου βία* seems necessary, for no violence to the bread is being thought of. It scarcely seems certain on the other hand that irregularity of syntax (as at *Cho.* 411 or 793) is a sufficient reason for emendation in Aeschylus, but in avoiding it Professor Murray is led (other doubtful passages apart) to a very difficult repunctuation of *Pers.* 913. There are a few other cases where it is surprising to find Professor Murray, usually so sympathetic to the mss., doubting their readings (as *P.V.* 442, *Theb.* 103, *Ag.* 1371).

His own conjectures have improved the text at several places. Good examples of small but valuable emendations are *σὲ μὲν* (with the explanation) *Theb.* 481 and *ἐκ δέκων* (a new and convincing inference from the Scholiast) *Cho.* 330: and Professor Murray's originality and ingenuity are nowhere better seen than at *Pers.* 954 (cf. *Theb.* 84),

Ag. 323, or the passage *Cho.* 829-38. But he always prefers to elicit his text from the mss. rather than resort to divination. His text is indeed conservative even where it is not orthodox. Yet even if one thinks that Professor Murray is sometimes too concerned with the application of palaeographical, no less than of syntactical, principles, he undoubtedly rests his text on a very solid basis and very frequently can present solid gains.

It remains to say that the fragments, except those of the relevant tetralogies, are not included. But the *testimonia* and *fasti theatri* are more fully given than they were by Sidgwick. New to editions of Aeschylus are the papyrus supplement to *Frag.* 36 and the epigram from the Agora. Professor Murray has replaced Sidgwick by a much more useful edition: that he has not, however, ignored his predecessor is pleasantly illustrated by his development of Sidgwick's suggestions at *Pers.* 676 and *Cho.* 451, and by many other references.

W. E. MUIR.

University of Glasgow.

GREEK VERSE IN TRANSLATION.

T. F. HIGHAM and C. M. BOWRA: *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*. Pp. cxii + 781. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d. The editors of this volume are to be heartily congratulated. Their task was obviously difficult, for many of the pieces in the corresponding Greek volume, to which they were restricted, had never been adequately translated, and for these they have made their own translations, or called in the assistance of friends. When versions already existed, they have ransacked libraries to find them, and have been catholic in their choice. Where many versions were extant, as of Homer and the dramatists, they have wisely not confined themselves to the best known, but given specimens of many kinds, including some in prose. The result is a fascinating volume, which this reviewer found it hard to lay aside. If, as they remind us in the Introduction, 'Translators are Traitors', and 'Trans-

lation is the death of understanding', this condemnation hardly applies to a catholic selection of translations. For each translator, if he is worth his salt, gives us at least one aspect of the poet translated. Samuel Butler, for instance, though he wilfully omits the poetry, makes it plain to the least intelligent reader that Homer can spin a good yarn. And if the same reader goes on to the other translators from Chapman downwards, it will go hard if he has not by the end found a composite picture of Homer not too unlike the original.

For the scholar this varied selection has an interest of another kind; for he will compare the versions to see which gets nearest to the spirit and form of the original, and try to discover which method best fits each case. The Introduction has an interesting discussion of the problems of translation, and in particular of the issue between the 'Hellenizers' and the 'Moderns'. In this,

Mr. Higham decides on the whole for the 'Moderns', and he is probably right; but the word 'modern' is misleading. In the sense here meant Chapman, for instance, is a 'Modern', for he deals freely with the original and aims at giving 'a poem for a poem'; and he does so successfully—he has been rather shabbily treated by the editors, and we should like more of him. Mr. MacNeice on the other hand (No. 252) is modern in his methods, but keeps very close to the original.

But methods are secondary. The translator, if he is a real poet, can carry off almost any method, and it is interesting to notice how often here, when the reader feels in reading a piece the authentic thrill, he finds at the bottom a familiar name: if he is wise, he will not look beforehand. And study of these translations suggests another point. Whatever the method, it must be consistent. Lawrence (for it is surely by that name and not as 'Shaw' that he is known to his peers among the shades) accused Homer of 'Wardour Street Greek'. He was wrong, for it is the incongruous archaism that suggests Wardour Street; but some of the translators here may fairly be accused of Wardour Street English, William Morris, for instance. He does suggest Wardour Street at times; Chapman does not, because he is all of a piece. And the incongruous modernism is equally disturbing; there are instances of that too.

Mr. Higham in the second part of the Introduction discusses clearly and sensibly the problem of form, how best to render in English the effect of the Greek metres, choric metres especially, and suggests that, where no method can be wholly successful, all are legitimate. He himself has gallantly and successfully translated three choruses of Aristophanes into the original metres (Nos. 418, 422, 430), but this is a unique instance, though some few of the translators have evidently sought to reproduce the effect of the original metre, notably G. M. Cookson and W. G. Headlam. Cookson's translation of the invocation from the *Choephori* (No. 253) and Headlam's version of Sappho (141) come very near to the metrical and

emotional effect of the original. The more usual method of employing recognized English metre with rhyme, though less ambitious, is successful in the hands of poets like Swinburne or Gilbert Murray, but has its dangers. The breaking of the original into short lines and stanzas, for instance, a common expedient, produces an effect alien to the original; so does a diction reminiscent of ballads and Scott. Translations into free verse or measured prose, whatever their merits, abandon the attempt. To use an old metaphor, they substitute a Gothic church for a Greek temple; it may contain the same stones, but the effect is quite different. It is very possible that to some of these translators the metre conveys no very precise effect, for the power to read the more complicated metres as verse is not common, even among scholars. More difficult still than to render the general effect of choric metres is the attempt to suggest the rhythm and cadence of particular lines, where these admit of variation, as in hexameters and iambics. This is a refinement which few translators attempt, but Calverley did so systematically, and his version of the speech of Ajax in No. 312 is a fine example of his skill.

The difficulties of translation are illustrated by one little point. Mr. Higham in § 5 of the Introduction discusses excellently the possible translations of Simonides' epitaph on the Spartans, and finally decides on a composite version (No. 212) which not all readers will prefer to the familiar lines of Bowles on which it is based. For one thing, the substitution of 'word' for 'laws' is questionable. For the word *ρήμασι* would naturally suggest to a Spartan the *ρήτραι* of Lycurgus in obedience to which he lived, and Simonides knew this. If so, 'laws' is the right word.

From such a multitude it is impossible to single out many pieces for criticism, and we may take the older translators as read; but a word must be spared for some of the newer. The editors are always competent and often happy, Mr. Higham, as a rule, the more vigorous. Mr. Highet has always a light touch, and his versions of Oppian into good

'Piers Plowman' alliterative metre are a refreshing change. Mr. Jack Lindsay's version of Hesiod (No. 67 (ii)) admirably preserves that author's mixture of homeliness and poetry. The versions of Mr. George Allen are often pleasing, but he is not free from the incongruities of diction discussed above.

The notes at the end of the book are useful and well chosen. The first part

of the Introduction, not hitherto mentioned, contains a brief account of Greek poetry by Mr. Bowra, which has the virtues we expect of his work. It is a sad sign of the times that the editors think it necessary to print some of the proper names with disfiguring accents, to show the pronunciation; e.g. that Pleiades is not a disyllable.

F. R. EARP.

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Sophie ABRAMOWICZ: *Études sur les hymnes homériques*. Pp. 96. Wilno:

Sw. Wojciech (for the Society of Friends of Learning), 1937. Paper.

Of these eight ingenious and learned essays the most interesting is a study of the 'Hesiodic' element in the hymns, by which is meant chiefly the presence of (a) a subjective or personal note, and (b) 'actualisme' or the tendency to relate myths not for their own sake in the Homeric manner, but for the purpose of explaining their significance and results for the poet and his contemporaries. Thus e.g. VI (save for the last three lines) and VII are classed as clearly 'Homeric', while XI and XX are 'Hesiodic'. An intermediate type also is recognized, marked by transitions from the ('Hesiodic') description of the general character of a god to the ('Homeric') narrative of a particular event, as in XIX and XXVI. There is some excellent literary criticism here: among its results one may note a telling statement of the case against Allen and Halliday's judgment that XXX is 'a genuine prelude in the Homeric style'. Miss A. sees in it the influence of Hesiod and of the Orphic hymns.

On the origin of the hymns good use is made of the lay of Demodocus to illustrate the view that the longer hymns are independent compositions (*ἐπύλλια* rather than *προοίμια* in the strict sense), and received the name 'preludes' from the shorter pieces (which alone deserved to be so called)

only after our collection had taken shape. On this view the collection must have been made before Thucydides referred to *Apōl.* as a *προοίμιον*. It might have been well to mention that not all the shorter poems can be satisfactorily regarded as introductions to epic recitations; but this fact does not impair the reasonableness of Miss A.'s position. She makes a good point also in finding the existence not only of the longer hymn (*du dieu*) but also of the shorter prelude (*au dieu*) attested by 'the author of θ' '; the latter is represented by the words $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \eta\rho\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$ (θ 499), which she is surely right in construing together (as also Calhoun does in *C.P.*, 1938, p. 205).

Other essays deal with *Apōl.* and its Typhaon-episode, and with the burlesque treatment of Apollo in *Hermes*. Miss A. is at her weakest in holding that the 'Pythian' hymn was attributed to Hesiod in antiquity. She adduces Hesiod fr. 265 (scarcely evidence of anything) and schol. on B 523, ignoring Allen and Halliday's argument on *Apōl.* 241—though it is by a precisely similar argument that she herself casts considerable doubt on No. 21 of Allen and Halliday's testimonia. But this is an enjoyable and useful work; and my sole complaint is of the failure to adhere (as she promises) to Baumeister's numbering of the hymns, whence much trouble and perplexity results for the reader in the neighbourhood of p. 45.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE GUILT OF ANTIGONE.

Ludwig BIELER: *Antigones Schuld im Urteil der neueren Sophoklesforschung*. Pp. 18. Vienna: Höfels, 1937. Paper, M. 1.20.

THIS lecture re-opens the question of the guilt of Antigone in the light of modern German interpretation, particularly the interpretations of Weinstock and Schadewaldt—but T. von Wilamowitz, Reinhardt, and von Blumenthal also are mentioned. The author excuses himself from a knowledge of non-German scholarship by the inadequacy of the libraries at his disposal, and only names M. K. Flickinger and Perrotta. He accuses modern German scholars of following intuition further than the evidence warrants, and finds the safest clue to Antigone's character in the utterances of the chorus, which he convincingly shows to be consistent through the play. Curiously enough he leaves out of account Antigone's final speech of self-defence and the problems contained in it.

For him the solution lies in the two comments of the chorus in the *Kommos*, 853 f., 872 f., which he finds foreshadowed by Ismene in the prologue. Antigone's action is pious, but her appeal to the gods—in the imagery of supplication to the high throne of Dike—is *ἔσχατον θράσους*. To withstand the might of the state which she knows must break her is *αὐτόγνωτος ὀργή*. Her action and its result spring from her Labdacid ancestry, which is respon-

sible both for her character and for the position in which she is placed. Her guilt consists in going beyond the limits imposed upon her.

The conclusion of this interpretation is right. One point however is doubtful. Bieler supposes the *ἔσχατον θράσους* to be Antigone's appeal to the gods. He therefore interprets *προσέπεσες* with Schmid (accepting Schneidewin's *ποδοῖν* for *πολύν*) as 'fall in supplication before'. Of course, *προσπίπτειν* can mean 'supplicate', but it appears always to be used with either the dative or the accusative in this sense. But the fact that Sophocles uses *προσπίπτειν* in this sense does not prove that he could use *προσπίπτειν ἐς* to mean 'supplicate'. It can only mean 'to fall' or 'strike against', for which Jebb provides a parallel from Polybius. Whether *πολύν* is then altered to *πολύ* or to *ποδοῖν* makes no difference. The passage means: 'Having advanced to the furthest verge of daring, you have struck against the high throne of Justice'. The *ἔσχατον θράσους* is not Antigone's appeal to the gods but something else; it must be her transgression of Creon's decree. Antigone is right in burying Polynices, wrong in disobeying the state; Creon is right in upholding the state's authority, wrong in forbidding the burial of Polynices.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

THE THEOLOGY OF CICERO.

Martin VAN DEN BRUWAENE: *La Théologie de Cicéron*. Pp. xxi+267. (Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2^e Série, 42^e Fascicule.) Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1937. Paper, fr. 50.

IF 'reading maketh a full man', the Baconian pronouncement was never better exemplified than in Cicero; but experience may be said to make fullness even fuller. He was more than a student—more than a slave of his

studies; for he had his own contribution to add to everything which he touched. While, then, it is reasonable to inquire into his sources, there arises the danger of all such inquiry that individuality may be underestimated. Borrowing can be charged against the most original of geniuses. Yet sources alone never account for a Virgil or a Dante: the use of Italian *novelle* or of North's Plutarch did not lessen the greatness of Shakespeare. Nor is Cicero to be adequately explained by a spate of *Quellenkunde* in which different critics (much as in Homeric inquiry) are

equally arbitrary and contradictory over the very same portions of his works. To more than one theory the rejoinder of p. 112 is applicable—'ce serait oublier que l'auteur de *Nat. Deor.* est non Panétius ou Posidonius, mais Cicéron.' It is quite possible to dwell among sources without ever reaching the full stream.

The author of this sensible book, though careful to investigate Cicero's sources, is yet equally anxious to discover Cicero himself in his writings. After a useful bibliography (Wissowa should be added), he lays the foundation of his special study in three chapters which deal respectively with Cicero's models and masters (including Plato, Aristotle, the Academy, Stoicism and Epicureanism), with his philosophical works in outline, and with the letters as clues to his unaffected convictions. There follow three chapters on books significant for Cicero's religious thought, *Tusculans I*, *De Natura Deorum II* and *III*. The derivative and eclectic elements are traced to their originals, and good grounds assigned for agreement with or dissent from previous scholars. The coherence of Cicero's arguments is often vindicated against attack, and his own contribution acknowledged. The theory of a 'double rédaction', a working up of notes made in student days, plays a considerable part. The three remaining chapters deal with Cicero's physics and the all-

important conception of *Natura*; with the possibility of foretelling the Divine Will; and with the guidance of Nature, which acting through its divine emanation, *Ratio*, leads man to his inevitable goal. If in Cicero we discover no true feeling of 'piety' in a modern sense, no deep assurance of divine aid, no clear hope of immortality, we do find the inspiration of a noble and sincere ideal in his views of deity. Tullia's death made him feel and think profoundly, though he had neither time nor temperament for thinking out his philosophical problems with unfettered independence. Yet his very doubts prove his weighing of alternatives. For him philosophizing did not consist in simple transcription: as an honest thinker, he found himself at times 'hesitating, tossed on a boundless ocean'; but his desire was to see clear.

An inserted leaflet corrects many errata, but not all. It was not 'M. Arnold' (p. xviii) who wrote *Roman Stoicism*; and too many misprints in Latin, French, German, and Greek words remain: e.g. *Vellius* (27), *appelat* (71), *dubitari* (109) for active, is for *iis* (110), *oculta* (166), *questiunculus* (201), *acceptée* (166), *superstition* (205), *Polhenz* (42), *zwischen* (15), *ἐσκοτισμένη* (171). All the same, the book makes a sound introduction to Cicero's religious thought.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

A LEXICON TO HERODOTUS.

J. ENOCH POWELL: *A Lexicon to Herodotus*. Pp. xii + 392. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 42s.

FROM a complete collection of word-slips to Herodotus made in 1912-1914 by L. Kalpers and F. Nawak, Professor Powell has 'compiled the present work, which attempts to combine the advantages of a lexicon with those of an index: . . . it notes every occurrence of every word or name used by Herodotus, *kai* alone excepted¹; . . . all words

are translated and the references classified by meaning and construction'. So at last we have a Greek prose author whose every word, however small, common, and important, has been considered and pronounced on by a scholar. Amazing industry, much thought and care, and fine scholarship have gone to the making of an exemplary lexicon which should help to dispel not a little

though it might not have pleased the Anglican divine who, commenting in a sermon on the words 'And one told Jacob', said 'The word *and* is but a particle and a small one; but small things are not to be despised; St. Matt. xviii. 10: "Take heed that you despise not one of these little ones"'. P. records all the occurrences of *ὁ* (23,341) and *δέ* (8,075).

¹ In all, according to P.'s statistics, *kai* occurs 7,551 times. References to 4,267 of these are given, the remaining 3,284 being all of simple *kai* connecting words and clauses. Reason must, I fear, approve the omission of these,

of the cloud of ignorance which rests upon so much of the Greek language. If one may regret that, doubtless because of cost, relatively few contexts are quoted, in form the work is well-nigh perfect and should serve as a model for all future compilers of special lexica. The typography, too, is excellent,¹ and the volume is at once pleasing to the eye and convenient to the hand.

Out of somewhere about 100,000 references I have tested only 631 (mostly in Book iii), but I dare say that is enough for the present purpose.

I have found few definite mistakes, and those slight. The second meaning of *διαλαμβάνω* ('divide') has been accidentally omitted: *ἐλπίζω* has the pres., not fut., inf. in viii 108, 1; *ἐλπίς* has the bare inf., not acc. and inf., in v 35, 4; I find no reference to the second *κατά* in iii 126, 2; *καταχαλκῶ* occurs in vi 50, 3, not vi 50, 2; s.v. *μύριος* the quotation from iii 74, 2 should read *τὰ πάντα οἱ μύρια δώσειν*; in iii 38, 2 the obj. of *νενομίκασι* is *τὰ περὶ τοὺς νόμους*, not *ταῦτα*; s.v. *ἔκου, ἡμελημένος* should be *ἀπημελημένος*; s.v. *ὅς ad fin.*, 'C. III' leads nowhere; s.v. *συνίστημι*, read *θάνατον* for *δλεθρον*.

I would suggest further that *βούλομαι* and *ἐθέλω* sometimes mean 'be willing', as also that *ζῶδιον* means 'figure' rather than 'picture' in i 70, 1, *κελεύω* 'permit' rather than 'command', 'tell', 'advise' in iii 31, 2 and 4, and *μεταξύ* 'mid-way between' rather than simply 'between' in iii 26, 3. 'Deposit with' seems an unfortunate rendering of *παρακατέθεντο* in iii 59, 1, and 'cookie' is surely too narrow for *πέμμα* (why exclude bannocks, baps, cakes, farles,

parlies, scones, shortie and the like?). 'Bronze' would be better than 'brass', 'brazen', s.v. *καταχαλκῶ, χάλκεος*, etc. 'How' and 'like' are solecistic as renderings of *τῆπερ* and *ὥς*, C.I.

Ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τῷ Μώμῳ κεχαρίσθω. I am glad to see that P. (unlike Hude) brands *αὐτά* in iii 116, 3 as spurious, for it seems to be merely a duplication of (*σπανιώτα*). He does not give 'hope' as a meaning of *ἐλπίζω* and *ἐλπίς*: this may surprise but can hardly be said to be wrong. He differs from De Sanctis (*Riv. Fil.* LXV pp. 398 ff., 403 ff.) over *ἀγνωμοσύνη* and *ἀγνώμων*, but agrees with him against Pohlenz in making *μέχρι ὅσου* = 'while' in viii 3, 2. He ranges the verb in *τούτους μὲν πάντες νενομίκασι* (iv 59, 1) under 'have, use, customarily', not, with Mr. Tate (C.R. LI. 3), under 'consider', 'believe', and rightly so, as I am inclined to think.² I am less disposed to assent when he takes *προστίθεσθαι* to mean 'adopt (an attitude)' in iv 65, 2 and vii 229, 2.

This lexicon is so good that one must hope that when the author has completed his eagerly awaited translation of Herodotus and critical edition of Thucydides he will give us a similar Lexicon to Thucydides.

W. L. LORIMER.

University College, Dundee.
University of St. Andrews.

² This is indicated, though not proved, to my mind, (a) by the context, (b) by Pl. *Mx.* 237d, reinforced by Hdt. iv 106, (c) by the fact that only by assuming that *νομίζω θεός* was sometimes used in the former or a kindred sense (as Dio Chr. supposed it was in Meletus' *ἀνταμοσία*) can we readily account for the strange 'omission' of *existential εἶναι* involved in the use, not to be denied, of *θ.ν. = θ.ν. εἶναι* (whence apparently *ἡγείσθαι θεός*—which *per se* seems hardly more natural than Milton's 'Unless there be who think not God at all', though *κατὰ ἀγμείνα* in Orac. *ap.* Dem. 1072 *fin.* is puzzling—and perhaps *deos putare, deos credere*).

ALCUIN AND CATO.

M. BOAS: *Alcuin und Cato.* Pp. 60.

Leiden: Brill, 1937. Paper, f. 1.25. THE author of this essay has published numerous articles on the *corpus Catonianum* and is the leading authority. Unfortunately his work has not received the recognition it deserves either in

Great Britain or in the U.S.A. The text of the *Disticha Catonis* in the Loeb *Minor Latin Poets* is little more than a reprint from Baehrens, and ignores all Dr Boas's contributions save one, published in 1921! The Wisconsin edition of W. J. Chase is even less serviceable

ura; with
the Divine
f Nature,
e emana-
inevitable
r no true
sense, no
no clear
find the
ere ideal
s death
foundly,
nor tem-
is philo-
inded
ts prove
For him
n simple
nker, he
sitating,
but his
s many
not 'M.
Roman
rints in
Greek
, *appelat*
s for iis
s (201),
Polhenz
η (171).
akes a
religious
DUFF.

s classi-
n'. So
author
small,
en con-
scholar.
ght and
gone to
lexicon
a little

Anglican
on the
he word
out small
att. xviii.
t one of
e occur-

and was castigated by Dr Boas in *Phil. Woch.* 47 [1927], 524-533.

Dr Boas is here concerned with the versified *Praecepta vivendi per singulos versus quae monastica dicuntur*, which used to be attributed to Columban, and which Baehrens to some extent used for constituting his text of 'Cato' without understanding their true character. Dr. Boas discusses three problems. Who was their author? What text of 'Cato' did he use? Which verses are borrowed from, or reminiscent of, the *Disticha*? With a wealth of additional evidence Dr Boas confirms Dümmler's thesis, that these 205 lines were composed by Alcuin. Next he seeks to show that the text used by Alcuin was not the medieval vulgate of 'Cato', but a MS belonging to the same family as the Veronese fragment. Finally he has reprinted Dümmler's text of the *Praecepta* with the addition of one line and has indicated marginally all the Catonian allusions or borrowings.

Only two criticisms suggest themselves. The topic with which the

author is dealing is in itself so intricate that it would have been a kindness to present it as clearly as possible. Not only is his prose involved, but frequently a long sentence is interrupted by parentheses or brackets. Thus, on page 13 a sentence of sixteen lines contains four bracketed additions, one running to four lines. Secondly, he seems occasionally to be in danger of spoiling a good case by trying to prove too much. Thus, the reviewer at least is not convinced that lines 12-13 of the *Praecepta* contain a reminiscence of 'Cato', for the resemblance is very remote. Or again, the similarities between Alcuin's poem xxxi, lines 7 ff. (pages 39-40) and certain Catonian lines are very slight and general. It would, however, be unfair to stress these blemishes, for there can be no doubt that the author has proved his main contentions up to the hilt. Can we not hope that he will soon publish a definitive text of the *corpus Catonianum*?

M. L. W. LAISTNER.

Cornell University.

A NEW TEXT OF CHARITO.

Charitonis Aphrodisiensis *de Chaerea et Callirhoe* amatoriarum narrationum libri octo. Recensuit et emendavit Warren E. BLAKE. Pp. xx + 142. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

THIS is much the best and the first well-founded edition of what papyrology to the confusion of literary criticism has shown to be the earliest extant Greek romance. Until recent years the Scriptores Erotici have languished in mid-nineteenth-century editions based on bad evidence and false principles. Charito's last editors were Hirschig and Hercher, of whom the latter was too ready to exact obedience to Attic rules, while the former displayed a carelessness only equalled by his ignorance. Neither they nor their predecessors ever saw the solitary manuscript (F). The *editio princeps* by D'Orville and its reprint by Beck were founded on an inaccurate collation by Cocchi; Hirschig and Hercher used Cobet's better collation, but since

Cobet supplied them with a copy in which no distinction was made between F's readings and his own conjectures, their texts are scarcely less unreliable.

In these circumstances an editor's first duty was to go back to F. This Mr. Blake has done, and his report of the readings inspires confidence. A slight indication of his accuracy is given by his note on I 35—*χόλου clare dispexi in F*. All previous editions show a lacuna, but I can vouch for the presence of *χόλου* (cf. C.R. XLII. 219). The revised collation is a more important asset than the new evidence of one parchment and two papyrus fragments. The former (Saec. VI-VII) differs widely from F, but F's authority is confirmed by the papyri (Saec. II-III), which usually offer only minor variants and seem in these to be wrong more often than right. In addition to the MS. readings Mr. Blake records almost every conjecture that has been made. He presents his critical notes in two sections, of which the first contains the

evidence for the printed text, the second corrections of previous collations and *emendationes minus probabiles*. The value of the second section is dubious; some interesting material is included, but all that was worth printing could without inconvenience have been incorporated in the first. Nor is the information faultless; there are, for instance, two false ascriptions on the second page.

The underlying principle of the text is sound. Mr. Blake aims at printing what Charito is likely to have written, and rightly rejects arbitrary restorations of pure Attic idiom. The inadequacy of the current editions of other Greek novelists sometimes leads him astray; thus Heliodorus IV 18 1 is no defence for ἀφιπνευσάμενος (III 7 2), but, like VII 29 2, supports Cobet's ἀφιππασάμενος. But on the whole his judgment is good, and he has often vindicated the MS. The knowledge that F's scribe was inclined to omit words has tempted him to make some needless supplements. Charito clearly aimed at brevity, and one characteristic of his style is asyndeton; it seems rash, therefore, to add connecting particles (e.g. γάρ I 2 2, VI 6 5; καί VI 3 8, VIII 4 2) or articles and pronouns not

strictly necessary (e.g. τήν I 1 13; με VII 3 10; σε IV 4 4). In filling the lacunae indicated by F he is often plausible, but there are places where he might have kept closer to the MS. At IV 7 6 F has . . ἐρ γὰρ πεπαιδευμένος. Mr. Blake adopts Reiske's οἷα γὰρ π., but Jackson, who knew nothing of the ἐρ, was surely right in proposing ἀνὴρ γὰρ π. It is a pity that Mr. Blake did not use Jackson's article (C.Q. XXIX. 52-7, 96-112); for in emendation he is not at his best, and he has adopted several conjectures inferior to those that he would have found there (e.g. II 1 4, II 2 2, IV 4 4).

But if he is not uniformly successful in correcting the MS. tradition, Mr. Blake none the less deserves gratitude for establishing it. When the evidence for the texts of all the Greek novelists is as well marshalled, scholars will be able to grapple more confidently with the linguistic problems. The book, which is very well produced, concludes with an analytical index of proper names and indices sententiarum et similitudinum.

R. M. RATTENBURY.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

NEW TEXTS AND VERSIONS OF PLAUTUS.

P. NIXON: Plautus, with an English translation. Vol. V: *Stichus*, *Trinummus*, *Truculentus*, *Vidularia*, and fragments. Pp. ix+368. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1938. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

A. ERNOUT: Plaute. Tome V: *Moscellaria—Persa—Poenulus*. Pp. 270. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1938. Paper, 40 fr.

THE concluding volume of the Loeb Plautus maintains the qualities which have made its predecessors so valuable—accuracy, liveliness, a consistent attempt to envisage every action or gesture and to extract the full value from every word. There is a misprint in the text of *Trin.* 191, and a clause in *Truc.* 481 is left untranslated; we would query the translation of *St.* 192 (surely the general sense of the line is 'unless

it' (i.e. the phrase quoted) 'suffers the worse fate of having to dine at home' (the supreme calamity in the eyes of a parasite). In *Trin.* 351 surely *malum* is in apposition with *illuc*. How can *quos* (*Truc.* 70) be taken as referring to *scorta* in the previous line? If the text is sound, it must refer back to *scorta et lenones* of 67. What *Truc.* 381 means need not be set forth here; but it is not like Professor Nixon to bowdlerize beyond the limits of accuracy. The interpretation of *em sic datur* (*Truc.* 634) seems improbable; surely the Captain addresses the words to himself—'Take that! there's the treatment you get!' The rendering of *Truc.* 818 ('I dare not move, poor wretch!') is perhaps the only example of 'translator's English' that Professor Nixon has perpetrated. We would question the staging of the opening scenes of the *Stichus*; surely

the women come on to the stage itself, leaving the door open behind them; the fact that they do not see Antipho, and that he does not see them, must be attributed to dramatic convention. The explanation of Crocotium's movements (*St.* 154) is unwarranted (the real explanation, we think, is that she appears in the doorway *during* the parasite's soliloquy), and the portrayal of Pinacium's demeanour (*St.* 364) is fanciful. Stasimus' words in *Trin.* 615 ff. do not suggest to us that Megaronides' house is on the stage; more probably Callicles goes off by the 'city' side-entrance. To balance these minor criticisms we might cite *St.* 630, *Trin.* 548, *Truc.* 602, for a few examples among many of neat and effective rendering.

The character of this translation as a whole was settled by Professor Nixon's choice of a frankly colloquial style. Such a style can never reproduce the qualities which Italians of subsequent generations, including Cicero himself, found in the Latinity of Plautus. Yet it is hard to see what other course Professor Nixon could have adopted; and he may fairly claim to have done more than anyone else in making his author accessible to English readers.

Professor Ernout's brief introductions are marked as usual by good sense. Ritschl ascribed the original of *Most.* to Philemon ('sur un indice bien faible', as Ernout drily remarks), and this ascription is treated in most works of reference as a matter scarcely admitting of doubt, though the passage on which Ritschl relied (1149 ff.) proves, if it proves anything, that the author of the original was *neither* Diphilus *nor* Philemon. The translator's care has for once failed him at line 335: we would translate 'To be sure, I'm going home for a d-drink'. 'No, no, you're

going *there*'. 'Ah yes, now I remember'. The heading to *Most.* act II sc. i is 'La maison est ouverte de telle manière qu'on voit les convives dans le vestibule, et qu'ils ont vue sur la place'. But the previous scenes have shown us the drinking-party assembling on the stage, i.e. on the open street—not in the vestibule. If the open street was private enough for the heroine to complete her toilet there, it is private enough for the drinking-party. Ernout is perhaps too ready to listen to the Germans in saying that 721a is 'tout à fait déplacé dans le dialogue'; Lindsay's text keeps the line.

In the introduction to the *Persa* Ernout rightly rejects Wilamowitz's attempt to date the original to a period before the fall of the Persian empire (an attempt based on line 506: 'Chrysopolim Persae cepere urbem in Arabia'). 'C'est accorder bien du poids à une indication qui peut être de pure fantaisie.' Line 100 is printed, without critical comment, in a form which the reviewer cannot scan as a senarius:

terrestris ! te coepulonus compellat tuus.

(Lindsay omits *te*.) *Paene*, in line 114, is disregarded in the translation. Why will editors defy the manuscripts and common sense in order to force Lemniscelenis on to the stage in act II sc. i? An unmentioned and unmotivated entry and exit in one scene is utterly out of keeping with the traditions of the *pal-liata*. Clearly the maid, alone on the stage, is addressing her mistress (within).

On the *Poenulus* we have space only to remark that '*leur amoureux*' (page 170) must be a mere slip; Agorastocles is much too thrifty a young man to fall in love with two sisters at once.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

PHYSIOLOGUS.

FRANCESCO SBORDONE: *Physiologus*. Pp. cxix + 332. Milan: Società Anonima Editrice 'Dante Alighieri', 1936. Paper, L. 60.

WHEN Robertson Smith took over the editorship of the *Encyclopaedia Britan-*

nica, and so got to know 'everything after the letter F', he found that his predecessor had forgotten 'Bestiary', and he made up for the omission by getting Land of Leyden to write on 'Physiologus'; to this day there is

no better account than Land put into two pages fifty years ago. Max Wellmann, in one of the last of his writings (1930), discussed the history of Physiologus with all his unrivalled knowledge of the lesser Greek naturalists; and now Dr Sbordone has given us, in a beautifully printed volume, a revision of the Greek text in its three well-marked and well-known versions—the early one, the Byzantine recension, and the so-called Pseudo-Basilean, with its allegories ascribed to St. Basil. He has collated countless MSS.; he has found in Paris the very copy of the Byzantine text which Ponce de Leon sent to the printers for his *editio princeps*; but, as B. E. Perry has pointed out, he has missed what is probably the oldest and best of all, a tenth-century MS. from Grottaferrata, in the Pierpont Morgan Library.

The Physiologist tells some forty stories, more or less, of the Eagle, the Pelican, the Fox, the Unicorn and the rest, and they are all told in much the same way. There comes a verse of Scripture to begin with,—‘Well hath David said . . .’; then the Physiologist’s own fanciful natural history; again a scriptural parallel; and, to finish off, *Καλῶς οὖν ὁ Φυσιολόγος ἔλεγε περὶ . . . τοῦ πελεκάνου*. The book was forgotten when the Middle Ages came to an end; but for centuries men had loved its stories, monkish artists had never tired of illustrating them, and great preachers had found an *ἀνω θεωρία* in the simple tales. It is part of an editor’s duty to tell us what

Augustine or Gregory the Great or Hilary or Ambrose said about them, and on the natural history side to find parallels in Horapollo, Phile, Tzetzes, Cyranides and the rest, or again in Aelian, Pliny, Aristotle and Herodotus. All this Dr Sbordone has done with great zeal and learning, but there are still hard questions to be asked and solved. ‘Aristotle’ has one after another of the Bestiary tales,—of the Eagle, the Hoopoe, the Night-raven, the Hyaena, the Ichneumon and so on. Some fifteen of these are in the *Historia Animalium*, and the curious thing is that they occur in just two places: I find eight in the Ninth Book, between pp. 612 and 630, and seven in the Sixth, between pp. 544 and 589. Are we looking for *sources* of the Physiologist in Aristotle, or is the Physiologist guiding us towards alien, fabulous, non-Aristotelian parts of the *Natural History*?

But to come back to our author. In his preface he thanks his master, Olivieri, ‘qui ante hos novem annos [1935] me paene puerum in hanc studiorum provinciam admiserit’; for which we may thank the old scholar, and heartily congratulate the young. He is indeed young to have written this learned and all but exhaustive book. He half promises to do for the Latin bestiaries what he has done for the Greek text. It will be a still bigger job; but when it is finished he will have done a great thing, and won the lasting gratitude of scholars.

D’ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

NOUN DECLENSIONS IN MEROVINGIAN LATIN.

Louis Furman SAS: *The Noun Declension System in Merovingian Latin*. Pp. xx + 531. Paris: printed by Pierre André, 1937. Paper, 50 fr.

In spite of much excellent work on the peculiarities of Merovingian Latin, it cannot yet be said that the basic problem of the relation of the written to the oral speech has definitely been solved. Many believe that already in the sixth century behind a façade of ‘artificial’ Latin there lies concealed an early form of French inaccessible

save through the ‘blunders’ of scribes who, while attempting to write traditional Latin, employed unconsciously features of colloquialism. Others hold that, on the contrary, the Merovingian documents give a relatively faithful picture of the spoken tongue and that therefore the birth of French must be brought down to the eighth or ninth century. Between these two extremes there may be several intermediate shades of opinion.

Sas believes that an accurate calcula-

tion of the comparative frequency of classical endings and their substitutes will help towards a decision. In each of some representative documents—namely, the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Bk. IV of Gregory's *Historia Francorum*, the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, the *Lex Salica*, the diplomas and charters in Lauer-Samaran and Tardif, and two formularies—he counts the various case-forms and expresses his results in percentages: e.g., in the *Formulae Andecavenses* the genitive function in the first declension is expressed by *-ae* (*-e*) in 57 per cent., by *de + -a* in 30 per cent., by *-a* in 4 per cent., and by *-am* in 9 per cent. of all the cases noted.

Several considerations impair the usefulness of this method. For some of the texts we do not possess the originals and it is quite impossible to make a mathematical allowance for later interference. Besides, much of a notary's expression is certainly stereotyped and copied from other documents or formularies of earlier date. Further, can we be quite confident about the accuracy of our labelling? In *vino modios tantos* is *vino* certainly a genitive? The accusative (Partitive Apposition) in such an expression is well-known. Again, although the notary seems generally indifferent whether he uses *-i* or *-o* in the genitive of the second declension, in a signature formula like *Signum Gundoberto* he regularly employs *-o*. Are

we to disregard these details and distinctions in favour of a simple but perhaps misleading mathematical formula?

Nevertheless, we are grateful for Sas's figures, for it is possible that, if all his documents were originals and his labelling of cases impeccable, his percentages would not be materially altered. He concludes that 'the written language of this period had a systematized declension norm which differed from the Classic Latin norm but which, nevertheless, was an organized system subject to rules and procedures which are quite regular for any given text.' For the genitive of the second declension one finds the endings *-i* and *-o* with occasional *-um* as well as the phrase *de + -o*. If this is 'regularity', one wonders what degree of variation would constitute 'irregularity'. He further concludes that 'the clues afforded by the M. declension do not indicate that Old French was already in existence but point rather to an oral language, similar in its general features to the written, which was to develop into a primitive form of the O.F. system in the latter part of the eighth or the early part of the ninth century'. The conclusion may or may not be right; sceptics who have proved adamant against arguments of a more general kind are not likely to yield to Sas's arithmetic.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

GREECE AND ROME FOR THE NEW PEOPLE.

The Civilisation of Greece and Rome.

By Benjamin FARRINGTON. Pp. 95.

(*The New People's Library*, Vol. VIII.)

London: Gollancz, 1938. Cloth, 1s. 6d. (paper, 1s).

AMONG the aims of *The New People's Library* it is stated that each book should be 'authoritative' and should 'assume no previous knowledge on the part of the reader'. Professor Farrington's book is certainly 'authoritative' in the sense that the writer has a thorough knowledge of his sources and is well entitled to express opinions on their meaning, and it is written with admirable clarity and candour. But one may doubt

whether it really serves the purpose of the series as announced. To give, in less than a hundred pages, any account of twelve centuries of cultural history which is likely to be of any real value to readers with 'no previous knowledge' is in any case a hardly possible thing: the most that could be done would be to sketch the outlines of the subject—with a fairly full chronological scheme—and to suggest plans and books for its further study. But this is not what is done here. There are no chronological tables, very few dates, no maps, and hardly any descriptions of the geographical setting. And there

is no bibliography. There are a few footnotes—less than a dozen altogether—naming about as many modern books: on Rome, for instance, Pelham's *Outlines*, Warde Fowler's *Rome*, and Mac-kail's *Latin Literature* (the last with a patronizing warning against its 'rosy spectacles'); but nothing on Greek history, and hardly any considerable standard work on the wider aspects of the subject except one of Toutain's and a casual citation from Rostovtzev. The reader is thus expected to take as 'authoritative', not only the author's statements of fact—which are not always correct in detail—but also his selection of the important and significant facts.

It is perhaps worth remarking that in the list of other items in the series there are two separate volumes of a *Short History of the Russian Revolution* from 1905 to the present day. The difference in scale between these and Mr Farrington's book is not without significance; for the effect which it seems likely to produce upon the reader's mind—his, that is, who has 'no previous knowledge'—is that the Graeco-Roman civilization was on the whole a rather stupid though pathetic mistake: it was based on a fundamental economic injustice, and most of its ablest thinkers' work was vitiated from the start because their constant—though not always conscious—purpose was to perpetuate and justify that injustice. Its history, therefore, is a history of failure, worthy of no more than the briefest glance from the modern student before he passes on to the vastly more instructive and im-

portant study of Marxian man. That, of course, is quite unfair as a description of Mr. Farrington's opinions; but it is to be feared that that will be the inference drawn by many readers of the kind for whom his book is avowedly intended.

Yet it is in many ways a very interesting and suggestive essay for other readers. One may note some slips in matters of fact—seven archons at Athens, an appeal by Philip V to Antiochus III for help against a Roman attack, a misdating of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*—and, more frequently, one may be surprised at the apparently haphazard and arbitrary choice of what to mention and what to omit. Alexander's conquests, and their political and economic results, are dismissed in a dozen lines; the extent of the Roman Empire—let alone the process and methods of its extension—is never indicated; the rise of Christianity is simply ignored, apart from one casual reference to its founder and one to the morals of Paulinus 'of Pella' (query: is it Paulinus of Nola?). But the passages of argumentation, though sometimes inconsequent, and far too allusive to be intelligible to the uninformed reader, are really interesting to one who has as much information as gives him the right to attempt to argue with the author: such as the opening pages with their text taken from Seneca, or the polemic against Plato, or the remarks on the achievements and the limitations of Alexandrian science.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

PROSYMNA.

C. W. BLEGEN: *Prosymna, the Helladic Settlement preceding the Argive Heraeum*. Vol. I: Text, and plates in colour. Pp. xxvi+486; 8 plates. Vol. II: Plates (731 illustrations, 52 plans). Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 147s.

EXPLORATIONS at the Heraeum, the great shrine of Argos, were begun in 1836 by General Gordon of Cairness, its discoverer. In 1854 Rhangabé made further trials and found the site

of the second temple. In 1878 Stamatakis cleared the tholos tomb by the road to Mycenae. In 1892-95 the American School under Waldstein (Walston) excavated the sanctuary, and laid bare the old temple-foundations with their cyclopean supporting wall, the second temple on the lower terrace with the stoai, and other buildings. In 1909 Friedländer pointed out that the tholos tomb and some of the objects from the American excavations indi-

cated that the shrine of Hera had grown up on the site of a prehistoric town dating at least from the Mycenaean age. This settlement may have been Prosymna, the name preserved by Pausanias as that of the district below the Heraeum. The site is an acropolis standing like Mycenae between two ravines, with a gentle slope from south and west, but precipitous cliffs on the north and east. It was thus naturally suited for man's occupation in early days when habitations required to be easy of defence. Dr. Hoppin, one of Waldstein's collaborators, wished to renew the excavations and investigate the early history of the site. The War and serious illness to which he ultimately succumbed in 1925 prevented him, but he had already made provision for the work to be carried out by the American School.

The excavations throughout, from 1925 to 1928, were conducted by Professor Blegen, and his name guarantees that all was done according to modern scientific practice. On the acropolis ample evidence was found that it had been inhabited from the beginning of the Bronze Age. Like the acropolis at Athens it had presumably been the residence of a ruler, but no sign of a 'palace' was found, and, if there was one, it presumably lay beneath the foundations of the first temple. The terrace wall which supports these, however, proved not to be older than the Geometric Period. East of the second temple an altar, like those at Nemea, Delphi, and Sparta, was found which appears to be older than the temple.

West and north-west of the acropolis the search for tombs was most successful. Several deposits of neolithic remains of the first and second periods came to light, characterized by painted pottery similar to that found elsewhere in Greece, especially in Thessaly. Some of the neolithic deposits seem to be burials, and none of them seems to be a habitation. The 32 Middle Helladic tombs, the most considerable group found in the Peloponnese, are cist tombs similar to those at Dimini and Sesklo, Orchomenos,

Eleusis, and Geraki. The pottery and other relics give fresh information about the culture of the period, and a group found above the roof of one tomb may explain the paucity of objects in the tombs themselves.

The 50 Late Helladic tombs, which belong to all three phases of this period, lie in separate groups and support Tsountas' theory that each group belongs to one clan or tribe. The tombs were family sepulchres constantly reopened and re-used. In the older tombs the sequence of burials from L.H. I to L.H. III is unbroken and demonstrates continuity of the race and culture. Among the thousand and more vases are excellent examples of the early style with decoration in lustrous paint which forms the transition from M.H. to L.H. I. The smaller objects comprise inlaid daggers, an ivory statuette, beads, buttons, terra-cotta figurines, and many other items all indicating that the settlement in the Late Bronze Age was prosperous.

Professor Blegen has done his work admirably. The earlier chapters describe the excavation, what was found and how it was found. The commentary opens with a chapter on the tombs and methods of interment and throws valuable light on burial customs and religious beliefs. Then come sections on each class of object, pottery, jewellery, bronzes, etc. The commentary in its analysis and interpretation is full, but laudably concise. The book, beautifully printed and produced, is important as the record of the first Mycenaean cemetery outside Mycenae scientifically excavated and published. All essential details are given so that the author's observations may be checked, for there is a clear plan of each tomb and the finds are fully illustrated. The colour plates are admirable and enable anyone who has not seen them to visualize the originals. This is a permanent contribution of great value because such archaeological work is the only sure foundation for any reconstruction of Greek prehistory.

A. J. B. WACE.

Cambridge.

AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome.
 Edited by Tenney FRANK. Vol. III.
 Pp. iv+664. Baltimore: The Johns
 Hopkins Press (London: Milford),
 1937. Cloth, 18s.

THIS is the third volume in this great survey, and it includes four countries in its scope: Roman Britain, by R. G. Collingwood, occupies 118 pages; Spain, by J. J. Van Nostrand, is given 106; Roman Sicily, by V. M. Scramuzza, is allotted 154; while Roman Gaul, by A. Grenier, extends to 266 pages. Thus this volume presents to readers a survey of the greater part of the western half of the Empire down to the dark days of the fourth century.

It is an impressive performance, and in a general review readers will not expect a detailed criticism. The section on Roman Britain will probably interest British readers most, and in it Mr. Collingwood shows all his usual skill in clear and brief expositions. (One misprint should be mentioned, as it might cause the unwary trouble; on p. 101 for *Hants.* read *Hunts.*) We note, among other things, the decay in the population of the towns during the third century; a good explanation of some puzzling features in the *Antonine Itinerary* (p. 21); some interesting remarks on the British villa-system (with which M. Grenier's account on p. 496 should be compared), and on trade beyond the frontiers. I could wish that Mr. Collingwood had thrown light on the statement which you will hear from any guide in the Derbyshire caverns, that vases of the local 'Blue John' were exported to Italy and have been found in Pompeii; but apart from such minor queries the whole section is complete, up-to-date, and masterly.

Mr. Van Nostrand's section is full and good: there is a translation of the famous Vipasca regulations (p. 167), full account is taken of the rich inscriptional material, and an interesting comment upon the productivity of the British lead-mines is the statement that 'no single Spanish ingot has been found which can be dated after the opening of the British fields' (p. 160). The ambiguous translation of Vespasian's

letter to Sabora (p. 146), which would suggest at first that the emperor had collared their *vectigalia*, is corrected by a better one on p. 212. Mr. Van Nostrand is too scornful of the 'mental inertia' of the Empire (p. 215), and makes merry over the official optimism of the Panegyrist, as does M. Grenier, who is perhaps a little too much inclined to credit Salvian. On this we may remark that things were never quite so good as the Panegyrist, so loudly proclaim or so bad as the Christian laments bewail: a careful critical method can extract plenty of value from both.

Mr. Scramuzza is extremely interesting on Sicily, to which he applies not only vast erudition but also his great local knowledge. His section (p. 237) on the *decuma* is well balanced, but though he has some useful criticisms of the numbers of slaves alleged to have been employed in Sicily, he seems to me rather to underrate the importance and significance of the Servile Wars.

M. Grenier's section, by far the longest, is both admirable and admirably written, though he has been allowed to adopt a different plan, which gives him an advantage. There are no seriously misleading misprints, though there are some minor errors, and in declaring that the loss of the three Varian legions was 'un accident facilement réparable' for the Empire (p. 511) M. Grenier takes a more light-hearted view than did Augustus. But the whole section is really excellent, a model of what such a work should be, and I would single out for special praise the concluding pages on the final decay, for which Gaul offers such rich material. (Incidentally I am glad to see that M. Grenier makes good use of the evidence to be obtained from coin-hoards, pp. 564, 570, and 573.)

One general comment: a little more editing, as in the matter of cross-references between the different provinces, would increase the usefulness of this volume. But I shall certainly keep it on a very near shelf.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

BUCHAN'S CAESAR.

John BUCHAN: *Julius Caesar*. Pp. 170.

London: Nelson, 1938. Cloth, 1s. 6d. This is a cheap edition of a book first published in 1932, giving a brief sketch of Caesar and his career, and making pleasant reading, as might be expected from its author. It should interest schoolboys, and others. For those who may wish to read more about Caesar there is a bibliographical note.

The point of view is that of one who holds that Froude and Mommsen weakened 'an argument . . . substantially sound, by overstating it'. 'Combined in [Caesar] in the highest degree were the realism of the man of action, the sensitiveness of the artist, and the imagination of the creative dreamer'. He had all the graces, and was essentially benign, though he could be 'harsh with the terrible politic cruelty of a society based on slavery'. And he had what in the circumstances was the right political idea. He started with a personal ambition, 'playing the obvious game for the obvious prizes', and with sentimental attachments to kin and party. 'But as he moved upward his motives . . . changed'. He acquired 'deeper and prouder loyalties', particularly to the idea that 'instead of a city and a host of servile provinces' there should be 'a universal Roman nation', under a monarchical government permitting 'wide local liberties' and working on principles of 'reason and humanity'.

Though it is said that Caesar was

'too far in advance of his age', there is no discussion of the question whether at the time of his death he was not on the way to make an empire much less strong and lasting than the one founded by Augustus. Of his opponents, Cicero is on the whole fairly treated, but Pompey and Cato are too contemptuously judged. In a vigorous account of 'the Republic in decay' it is not made quite as clear as it might be how Roman republican principles left the central government too weakly organized in this age both for keeping order in Rome and for controlling the armies (that is, for averting civil war), and why this could be remedied only by recourse to monarchy in some form. The lively narrative that traces Caesar's action may not always tell the most probable story, but slips seem to be few and unimportant. The scope of Caesar's municipal legislation is surely exaggerated on p. 148.

The portrait of Caesar's mind hardly conveys his feeling about his *dignitas*. And it might be argued that of all his interests the one that probably most gave unity and direction to his career was in finding exercise for his powers in trying to realize an ideal 'Caesar'—'for always I am Caesar'; which would place his 'motives' in a rather different perspective from that in which they are presented in this book.

C. G. STONE.

Oxford.

SOME VASSAL QUEENS.

Grace Harriet MACURDY: *Vassal Queens and Some Contemporary Women in the Roman Empire*. Pp. xii+148; 1 frontispiece and 2 plates (of coins). (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 22.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1937. Cloth, 14s.

THIS monograph, a continuation of the author's *Hellenistic Queens* (C.R. XLVI. 167), contains a clear and detailed account of various royal women who came into contact with the Roman Empire,

ranging in time from Teuta of Illyria to Zenobia of Palmyra, and in space from Mauretania to Commagene; it includes queens and princesses of Bithynia, Pontus, Bosphorus, Thrace, Judaea, and even Britain. It is well written, though the material hardly offers the best scope for Miss Macurdy's gifts of narrative. In addition it is admirably got up and produced: the few misprints, on pages 9, 47, 103, and 106, will not lead anyone astray, though by a curious lapse one of Kornemann's works is consist-

ently cited as *Doppelprinzipat und Reichseinteilung*, and on page 113 a main verb has apparently dropped away.

Save where the genius of Josephus (for whom Miss Macurdy rightly spares a word of praise) can be drawn upon for the turbulent story of the fortunes of the house of Herod, the literary evidence for most of these royal women is sparse. In the main we have before us an account of political marriages, of dynastic ambitions, and of quarrels, all somewhat hampered and overshadowed by the power and proximity of the Roman Empire: in Hellenistic times many of these queens might have played a more sensational part. As it is, apart from statues (the frontispiece gives the fine bronze bust of Queen Dynamis), coins and inscriptions, or from 'some casual mention in the pages of Tacitus, Strabo or Cassius Dio', we can know little except the bare details of birth, marriages, and death. Yet some of them must have been able and energetic rulers: for instance Pythodoris, of whom Strabo observes that 'she is a good woman and competent to administer affairs', and whose children all 'turned out well', or Cleopatra Selene in Mauretania, or Antonia Tryphaena in Thrace and Pontus. For years these

women must have done a great deal of patient and unrewarded work for civilization.

For the rest I cannot avoid a feeling that it was just as well that the Empire could hold in check the ambitions, cruelties and jealousies of these small courts; Herod's family perhaps contains the worst examples, e.g. Salome, of whom only one gracious act is recorded (p. 74), but Thrace and Bosphorus provided their quota. Granted that sometimes Rome's methods were violent—and I could wish that Miss Macurdy had found time to discuss what has always seemed a mystery to me, the extraordinary suddenness and brutality of the annexation of Commagene in A.D. 73 (p. 100)—yet in the long run the subjects of these kingdoms must often have benefited.

To sum up: the book is thorough and detailed, comprehensive and careful, with some new and attractive hypotheses, and a useful appendix upon the eclipse that helps to fix the date of Cleopatra Selene's death (p. 60). Altogether it is a worthy edition to the Johns Hopkins *Studies in Archaeology*.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

St. John's College, Cambridge.

ROME UNDER THE EMPERORS.

H. W. HOUSEHOLD: *Rome, Republic and Empire*. Vol. II—*The Empire*. Pp. xi+316; 2 maps. London: Dent, 1938. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS volume completes Mr Household's set of four school manuals of Greek and Roman history, of which the third was published in 1936, and it well maintains, and indeed betters, the high standard of the others. Of the last one, that on the Republic, the author said that it was 'not for Classical Sides', but there are few Classical Sides which, in their lower and even their higher forms, would not be the better for having him to introduce them to this province of their subject. Certainly the present volume, which covers a good deal of ground not commonly traversed by schoolboys, is about as sound and inspiring a guide as any teacher could wish for. The writing

is clear, simple and vigorous, the proportions are well adjusted, the statements of fact generally accurate, and those of opinion suggestive without undue dogmatism.

In the earlier and more familiar reaches of the narrative—which begins on the morrow of the Ides of March, and gives a fairly full account of events between that and Actium—Mr Household, as is natural and proper, follows the Augustan version and the more or less normal or orthodox story of the Caesars, with some useful hints on how to read Tacitus and Suetonius. Here and there one could point to statements of fact—none of them very important—which might be queried or even corrected in details: as on Antony's retreat from Mutina (which was across the Ligurian Apennines, not the Alps), or the chron-

ology of his association with Cleopatra (which was completely severed for nearly four years after his first Alexandrian winter); or the alleged 'repeal' of the treason-law under Caligula (not repealed, but for a time in desuetude); or 'Vineus' for Vinus as the name of Galba's evil genius; or an antedating of the fortresses at Caerleon and Chester (built under Vespasian, not under Claudius). But these things matter not at all to the general effect.

It is, however, in the later chapters, from M. Aurelius to Romulus Augustulus, that Mr Household's best work is done—and the more important because the period has had so little justice done to it in ordinary classical curricula, in which history has been too much subordinated to literature, and an age

which had no good writers has been passed over as without interest. The vigorous narratives, for example, of Pertinax, Julianus and Severus, or of Zenobia, or of Constantius Chlorus in Britain—to take instances at random—will give schoolboys a fresh sense of adventure and of the large current of history; and the vivid illustrations of the conditions of life—Galen reorganizing the army medical service, the life of the nobles in Gaul as shown in the letters of Sidonius—and the frequent and always skilfully placed quotations, help to heighten the actuality and significance of the bare facts. It is a book to be heartily commended to all teachers and pupils—and not only to beginners.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

TAXATION IN ROMAN EGYPT.

Sherman Le Roy WALLACE: *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*.

Pp. xi + 512. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 25s.

SINCE the masterly survey by Wilcken in vol. I of his *Griechische Ostraka* (1899) no comprehensive study of the taxation system of Roman Egypt has been attempted. This is easy enough to understand; for the field is a huge one and beset with difficulties. Particular taxes and groups of taxes have been discussed by editors with reference to the texts which it fell to their lot to edit, and naturally these discussions have elucidated various features of the system, though they have at times served merely to reveal new and perplexing problems. Meantime the mass of material on which any treatment of the subject must rest has steadily grown.

Mr. Wallace began his study in 1931. The seven years which have elapsed have, as this volume testifies, been well spent, and the result is a work which will be in constant use by papyrologists and historians. It could hardly be expected that the many problems which obscure our understanding of the system—curiously many considering the amount of available evidence—would

all be solved, and indeed much remains, even after Mr. Wallace's treatment, exceedingly obscure. Some, however, he does bring nearer to a solution. The varying rates of poll-tax, for example. Why did the rate differ from nome to nome, at Thebes indeed from quarter to quarter? Well, in the first place, Mr. Wallace would reply, the variation was probably not so great as has been supposed. He suggests that the numerous rates at Thebes are reducible to but two; and for Egypt in general he conjectures that there was a normal rate (for the unprivileged) of 16 drachmae. And secondly, he very plausibly explains the high Arsinoite rate (40 drachmae for the unprivileged, 20 for the metropolitans) as due partly to the special fertility of the soil, partly (for the metropolitans) to exemption from certain capitation taxes levied in other nomes. On the other hand, the problem of the poll-tax in the third century remains as puzzling as ever.

The work is well arranged, beginning with an account of the cadastre and passing, by way of the various taxes in kind and the money-taxes on land, to taxes on animals, the census, poll-tax and other capitation taxes (including trade-taxes), and then to the customs. After a chapter on some miscellaneous

taxes the methods of collection of money taxes are described; and finally, in a chapter entitled 'The Revenues of Egypt' Mr. Wallace estimates the total yield and essays some judgement on the system as a whole. His verdict is more favourable to the Romans, or at least to Augustus and the earlier government, than that of some writers; and though I for one cannot accept his

view without qualification, his remarks deserve careful scrutiny. He seems to be right in holding that there was no appreciable rise in the rates before the third century; and even then the apparent rise may have been due rather to the depreciation of the currency than to a real increase.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

THE SENATE FROM SEPTIMIUS TO DIOCLETIAN.

P. LAMBRECHTS: *La composition du sénat romain de Septime Sévère à Dioclétien* (193-284). (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I, Fasc. 8.) Pp. 130. Budapest: Institut de Numismatique et d'Archéologie de l'Université P. Pázmány, 1937. Paper, pengő 12.

IN 1936 Dr. Lambrechts published an important work on the composition of the Senate in the second century A.D.; in the present book he has extended his researches to the following century. The study deserves the most cordial welcome and appreciation. In comprehensiveness and accuracy of detail it supersedes all previous approaches to the same subject. Not only has new material been collected, but the older evidence has been subjected to a vigorous and honest criticism. The result is a series of lists of senators divided into categories according as their identity, and sometimes also their origin and careers, are certainly established or merely probably attested.

The book has two parts. In the first the material is collected and arranged, in the second the inferences to be drawn from it are considered. Because of the rapid succession of emperors during the third century, the author has wisely departed from the plan of his earlier book, and has not treated each reign separately. Instead he divides the century into three periods. In the first the reigns of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, in the second those of Elagabalus and Severus Alexander are grouped together, while the last comprises all the subsequent emperors down to the accession of Diocletian. A summary of the results of the enquiry will indicate both the thoroughness of the

author's researches and also incidentally the poverty of the ancient sources for the central years of the third century. The first period furnishes the names of 461 senators, of whom 391 are attested as certain, while the remainder may have entered the order at an earlier date. For 183 of these the author has found their country of origin, and of these 36 per cent. are Italians and 64 per cent. provincials, mainly from the Eastern provinces and in a lesser proportion from Africa. In the second period there are 363 names, of which 245 certainly belong to the years 218-235. But of only 132 of these can the *provenance* be established; 56 are Italians and 76 provincials. Lastly, the third period provides 300 names; 22 are Italians and 33 provincials. The origin of the remainder is unknown.

In the second half of his book the author discusses the interpretations that may be given to this material. In some cases he corrects earlier theories about the policy of individual emperors, in others he produces constructive evidence for existing opinions. The view of Rostovtzeff that the Senate under Septimius Severus contained a larger proportion of Italians than provincials—which that historian uses to support his hypothesis of the emperor's antipathy to the provincial *bourgeoisie*—is effectively refuted by the ascertained facts. At the same time the opposite theory of von Domaszewski that Septimius barbarized the Senate by the admission of Orientals and Africans is countered by a right insistence upon the equally high, if not superior, level of culture possessed by these provincials relatively to the inhabitants of Italy.

In the second period the figures suggest a rise in the proportion of Italian to provincial senators. But the author, justly, I think, refuses to accept this as evidence for such a radical change of policy as the *Life of Alexander* in *S.H.A.* would have us believe was effected. Against such a conclusion he calls attention to the difference between the problems which Septimius and Alexander respectively had to face. The former had decimated the Senate by persecution, and had in consequence many places to fill in the House: not unnaturally in the circumstances he turned to the provinces for his new recruits. The latter found a much more stable condition of affairs, and replenished the normally recurring vacancies by a more or less equal selection of Italians and provincials.

Two further points deserve attention. Dr. Lambrechts, although rejecting Professor Baynes' interpretation of Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 37. 5-6, for

reasons which I do not find wholly convincing, supports C. W. Keyes' version of the effect of Gallienus' edict upon the future position of senatorial governors in imperial provinces, and raises the further interesting question whether the same process was not also at the same time set about in the senatorial provinces. Secondly he rejects Jardé's interpretation of Severus Alexander's change in the status of the praetorian prefects (*Vita Sev. Alex.* 21. 3-5), and argues that, whereas previously only *ornamenta consularia* had been conferred upon them, now on entering upon their office they were to become actual senators. The title *vir eminentissimus*, he maintains on the analogy of later usage, no longer implied membership of the equestrian order, but served to distinguish the prefect from other senators. The suggestion is interesting and merits a fuller discussion than is possible in a short review. H. M. D. PARKER.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

COINAGE AND CURRENCY IN ROMAN BRITAIN.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND: *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain*. Pp. xii + 184; 14 collotype plates. London: Milford, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THIS book affords yet another excellent illustration of the ever-increasing importance of numismatics for the student of the Roman Empire. From a comparative study of hoards and site-finds the author has constructed what may be termed a numismatic history of Britain from pre-Roman times to the sub-Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. Text, notes and appendices all bear witness to the vast quantity of material which has been handled and to the amount of minute and patient toil which the work has involved; and the result is an eminently readable and lively narrative of Romano-British history as seen from a fresh point of view. Familiar facts of political history are further illuminated by the author's treatment of such subjects as the diffusion and volume of official Roman coins in Britain and of their duration in currency, the evidence of literary sources and archaeological

monuments being often most strikingly paralleled by that of the coinage. Fresh facts, too, sometimes emerge, such as the sturdy independence of third-century British provincials in resisting the introduction of the *antoninianus* and in attempting to maintain the *denarius* in regular currency (pp. 39 f.). Specially interesting as numismatic illustration of political history are the chapters on the British Empire (Ch. VI) and on the Tetrarchy and the House of Constantine (Ch. VII). Is it, however, correct to state (p. 72) that 'nothing is known [under the Tetrarchy] of any scheme of national defence for the western area'? Both Cardiff and Carnarvon afford traces of fortifications of the 'Saxon Shore' type.

The second section of each chapter is devoted to the coins copied in Britain from official Roman prototypes. The economic reasons for the manufacture of such copies are investigated and the copies themselves admirably illustrated by fourteen plates. Incidentally this part of the book throws some interesting side-lights upon artists and artistic

taste in Roman Britain (see especially Appendix II on the classification of radiate copies).

Among other individual points of special interest and value mention may be made of the account of coin-moulds and their use (p. 44), of the interpretation of the famous Blackmoor hoard (p. 68), of the discussion, from the numismatic angle, of the theory of a partial re-occupation of south-eastern

Britain in the second and third decades of the fifth century (p. 93 f.), and, above all, of the author's investigation of the problem of radiate *minimi* in Appendix I.

Appendix III contains a most serviceable chronological list of Roman hoards in Britain, and there is a special index of hoards.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

PERSONALITY IN ROMAN PRIVATE LAW.

P. W. DUFF: *Personality in Roman Private Law*. Pp. xiii+241. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 15s.

MR DUFF has given us an excellent work on a subject of great interest to the historian, the Roman lawyer, and the general philosopher of law. He begins by discussing the significance of the words *persona*, *caput*, *corpus*, and *universitas* in legal and other texts, and in so doing shows an acute and sensitive perception of varying shades of meaning. He is admirably pungent in dealing with some of Albertario's more strained conjectures and with the tendency of even the greatest German scholars to read into the texts of practical Roman lawyers all the theoretical implications that they can be made to bear when 'konsequent durchgedacht'. His own conclusion is that, while Roman law did eventually reach a conception like that of the English 'corporation,' the idea that in addition to individuals there might be other units having rights and duties in the law, it did not work out any conscious theory of their nature and origin; it had neither name nor idea corresponding to the German 'juristische Person'.

Most of the book is taken up with a careful study of the rules of private law relating to such entities of this kind as were known to Roman law—the *populus Romanus*, the *fiscus*, towns, *collegia*, *societates publicanorum*, the *hereditas iacens* (which in Mr Duff's view was not definitely personified), and (in the Christian Empire) the Church, churches, and charities. As his province does not include public law Mr

Duff dismisses the *populus Romanus* in a few lines, and the *fiscus* has a hardly greater claim to relevance. He discusses, however, and rejects the view of Mitteis that it was owned neither by the Emperor nor by the *populus* but by itself—a kind of personified *Zweck*. 'The Romans always say and may be presumed to have thought' that it belonged to Caesar, a man and not a Legal Person, although he was under a moral obligation to spend its revenues on the needs of the State.

The stages by which Roman lawyers reached the idea of a *universitas* in connection with *municipia* and *collegia* are unknown. Mr Duff has to fall back on conjecture, but his conjectures seem reasonable and plausible. In his examination of the texts dealing with the legal position of *municipia* he shows that the law was not systematized on *a priori* theory, and that even great classical lawyers like Ulpian sometimes failed to keep clear the distinction between *universi municipes* and the *universitas* as such. The history and law of *collegia* show the same tentative development and unsystematized conclusions. The difficult question of the *ius coeundi* and the position of unauthorized *collegia* are fully discussed.

In Byzantine times the law came to recognize the Church, particular churches and many types of charitable foundations (some, in Mr Duff's view, not under ecclesiastical control) as in some sense independent entities. But again there was no unified theory. 'We are back in an age which finds it easier to enumerate than to generalise.' The legal position and powers of the man-

agers of charitable funds were fairly clear; who—manager, staff or beneficiaries—should be theoretically deemed to be their owner was not at all clear; certainly Roman thought did not know the German conception of the personified Fund or Purpose.

Mr Duff's arguments are often detailed and his style is subtle and terse. He assumes a knowledge of the elements of Roman law; he assumes, too, that his reader will not require translations of the numerous passages of Latin,

Greek, German, and in one instance Norman-French, which he incorporates into his text. But, though his book demands, it will well repay, close attention. It is a permanent contribution to historical and legal scholarship, the fruit of fourteen years of study, based on exact and thorough knowledge, shrewd and penetrating in its criticism, and reasoned and temperate in its conclusions.

A. H. CAMPBELL.

University of Birmingham.

THE SPIRIT OF ROME.

R. HEINZE: *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze herausgegeben von Erich Burck.* Pp. iv + 296. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1938. Cloth, RM. 7.20.

IN the early years of this century, Richard Heinze won a secure place for himself as an interpreter of the Augustan poets. But the reviser of Kiessling's commentary upon Horace and author of *Vergils epische Technik* did not rest satisfied with those masterly achievements. The War of 1914-19 and the disturbed years of peace worked upon him. He pondered more and more upon the life and thought of the Romans, upon the religious and moral concepts that reveal, as nothing else can, the spirit and peculiar essence of a nation. During the War he had delivered lectures to German soldiers in Rumania upon the political and moral background of Augustan literature. After his death they were published by Körte under the title *Die augusteische Kultur* (1930). Popular in the best sense of the term, they showed Heinze's individual gift of sympathetic interpretation and attractive presentment. These qualities are everywhere to be discovered in the volume here reviewed.

'Humanism' is a fair-sounding word, but vague and emotional, capable of being invoked to support all manner of doctrines or causes. Heinze sought the ancients for themselves, found them in their own social and spiritual context—and did not drag them out of it. It was his aim to discover how they really felt and thought; and in this he

was Hellenic in spirit, a scientist as well as a scholar.

It is a primary necessity to establish the meanings of those words that embody the 'values' of a people or a class. Now such notions are not eternal and absolute, but conditioned by time and place, subject to change. What appear at first sight to be moral and religious concepts often turn out to be much more like political and social terms. Such are, for example, 'fides', 'pietas', and 'auctoritas', even 'virtus'. How discover their real meaning? Clearly not by translating, for they very properly defy translation, but by patiently examining them in their own context. *Pius Aeneas*: the epithet always gives trouble. Should one really understand by it 'that trained liturgiologist', in the words of a current (or perhaps obsolescent) academic jest? Hardly—why did the Pompeians at the last battle in Spain take *Pietas* as their watchword, why did Sex. Pompeius, loyal to father and family, adopt a *cognomen* and call himself 'Magnus Pompeius Pius'? The hero of the Roman national epic is 'pius'—and so is Augustus himself, not so much from care for cult and ancient monuments as because he undertook the sacred duty of avenging his father.

This volume contains nine articles or addresses, all except one deriving from the last ten years of Heinze's life. (1) 'Auctoritas' is the article in which Heinze, when a momentous fragment of Augustus' *Res Gestae* had been discovered, at once demonstrated the true

nature of the concept and its pervasiveness in all Roman thought and life. (2) 'Fides' deals with another of these terms, with especial reference to law and politics, starting from the paper of Ed. Fraenkel (*Rh. Mus.*, 1916, 187 ff.). (3) 'Ciceros politische Anfänge', the longest of these papers (pp. 59-141) and the only one previous to the War, is a reasoned defence of Cicero's early career against the charge that, a *popularis* to begin with, he changed sides as soon as he won the consulate. As Heinze shows, many of Cicero's pronouncements and actions are to be explained by the fact that he was an advocate, a *patronus*. Apology is a treacherous form of discourse; and some may feel that Heinze has here accorded more indulgence than a politician deserves to receive. No matter—Heinze is not dishonest or emotional in his advocacy. (4) 'Ciceros Staat als politische Tendenzschrift' struck a death-blow at the pretentious theories of Reitzenstein and Ed. Meyer. Cicero was not writing to urge the setting-up of some kind of principate of one man—still less to support the instalment of Pompeius in that position. What the tract sketches is the Roman *πάτριος πολιτεία*; and the term 'rector' or 'moderator rei publicae' is merely the translation of *ὁ πολιτικός*. (5) 'Kaiser Augustus' shows how old-fashioned and even archaic the Princeps was in belief and habits: one of the men from the *municipia*. The next three papers, 'Die horazische Ode', 'Der Zyklus der Römeroden' and 'Horazens Buch der Briefe', all of which originally appeared in the *Neue Jahrbücher*, are 'popular' in

character, but acute and convincing: for example, Heinze disposes of the view that *Odes* 3, 1-6 are, as so many have thought, a unity in purpose and in date of composition. (9) 'Urgentibus imperii fati', an unpublished paper, attacks Reitzenstein's interpretation of this difficult passage (*Gött. gel. Nachr.*, 1914, 252 ff.) and argues firmly that Tacitus is expressing despair, not about the future of the Empire, but about its present condition.

Such, in brief, are the contents of this volume. Many of the essays, though recent in date, have already been able profoundly to modify dominant opinions or to banish misconceptions old and new about the central and classical period of Roman literature and Roman history: some are classics themselves. The editor has done his work well. He has added, not merely a full bibliography of Heinze's writings, but also an appendix of supplementary notes, showing the present state of certain of the questions discussed by Heinze. The fruitful influence of his work is especially attested by the large number of subsequent articles and dissertations upon Roman moral and political notions, to mention only *Magnitudo animi* (Knoche), *Concordia* (Skard), *Pietas* (Ulrich), *Dignitas* (Wegehaupt) and *Libertas* (Kloesel). The book is not only useful and eminently readable—it is elegantly got up and very cheap. There can be no excuse for not purchasing this memorial to a great scholar and a good man—'vir bonus dicendi peritus'.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GREEK TRAGIC FORM.

August C. MAHR: *The Origin of the Greek Tragic Form. A Study of the Early Theater in Attica*. Pp. xviii + 247; 37 figures. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1938. Cloth, \$3.

IT will be best to let the author define his own aim, which is not 'to till the patient soil once more with the conventional tools of philology, literary criticism and archaeology; but rather to apply the methods of art-criticism and

aesthetics to define the fundamental time-space pattern of the Dionysian cult play in Attica, and subsequently to demonstrate how the tragic drama and its theater have derived their characteristics from it through a natural process of development.' In fulfilment of this we learn (*e.g.*) in regard to the dance-figures of the dithyramb that 'through their relation to the center of a circular plane they were no longer

a one-dimensional progression, but aesthetically they became essential constituents of the two-dimensionality of that plane as its variable functions. Naturally, this condition also possessed its specific dynamics. They were, however, not of an additive nature as were those of one-dimensional progression, but they were characterized by a multiplicative relation of their integrity. Such multiplicative dynamics are synonymous with intensity in both a physical and an aesthetic sense. Intensity, in the latter meaning, is the type of dynamics that governs lyric poetry which, figuratively speaking, regards its object as a center, and therefore moves around it, as it were, and by incessant radial approaches gains an accumulative insight into its very essence. . . . It should be noted that the centripetal dynamics of the dithyramb are reciprocated by the centrifugal dynamics of its effect on the spectators' (pp. 27-29). For those who find this illuminating, there is plenty more of the same kind. *E.g.* we learn (p. 121) of a particular development in Comedy that 'the third dimension, that of space proper, gradually moved into the reach of aesthetic possibility some time before the stratified plane definitely surrendered to the Hellenistic proscaenium,' etc.

If Dr. Mahr had been content to trace in simple language the parallelism between the development of the growing interest in the actors as compared with the chorus, on the one hand, and the elaboration of the theatre and

scenery on the other, he would have given us a useful essay; but his mathematical terminology does not really assist the understanding, and his comparisons of the drama with sculpture, architecture and Italian opera are sometimes fanciful and unconvincing. His attempt to trace all future developments from a beginning in which a chorus, tied to one spot, is approached by a stranger anxious to overcome its resistance is really contradicted by his own survey of the plays of Aeschylus, and not, as he supposes, confirmed by it. The facts are sometimes made to fit his theory: *e.g.* few scholars now suppose that the cothurnus worn by the earliest actors was the stilt-like sole of the well-known statuette, and Dr. Mahr knows much more about Thespis, the pinakes and other things than is given to mere students of the evidence, working with the 'conventional tools.' His accounts of the Athenian theatre at different times show no acquaintance with the highly important work of Bulle (1928) and Fiechter (1936). But there are here and there interesting points, *e.g.* about the function of the earliest background, the eccyclema, continuity in time, the *Prometheus Vinculus*, and some other matters, and these make it a pity that so much space should have been taken up in explaining *obscurum* (or even *lucidum*) *per obscurius*.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

Karl REINHARDT: *Das Parisurteil*. Pp. 31; 1 plate. Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1938. Paper, (export price) RM. 1.31.

THE author, recognizing that a discovery at Sparta has put the date of the traditional Judgement of Paris further back by a century or more than some literary critics would have placed it, goes a step forward and declares that Homer must have known of it ('Homer,' to him, is the author of the *Iliad*; as regards the *Odyssey*, the chorizontic ghost still squeaks and gibbers). Only thus, he holds, can we account for the determined hostility of Hera and Athena to Troy, unmotivated in the poem and not to be explained by purely political considerations, such as the nationality of the various deities. With this theory goes some well observed fact; Reinhardt gives an excellent and sensitive account of the way in which mythological episodes, unsuited in themselves to be material for heroic

epic, are yet used in the *Iliad* as situations; i.e., knowledge of them is assumed and the characters proceed to act as they might be expected to act if such things had happened. He might have added that here Homer is a true fellow-countryman and fellow-artist of Euripides.

The reviewer disagrees with the author when he proceeds, as usual, to find positive proof of the pre-existence of the Judgement in those well-worn lines, Ω 29-30. That these are genuine no one need doubt; that they refer to a foolish deed of Paris and, if we like to say so, a Judgement is certain. But that they contain a reference to the Judgement the reviewer continues to deny. Paris, in the classical story, did not 'rail on' any goddess, nor was he given *μαχλοσύνη*, which means the power to make women desirous, but the hand of one particular woman. The most that can be said

is that we have here the story out of which someone, the author of the *Kypria* or another, made the familiar tale.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Omero, *Odissea*, libro VI, con introduzione, commento e indici analitici di Antonio GIUSTI. Pp. vii+70. Turin: Lattes, 1938. Paper, L. 5.

GIUSTI has produced a very useful little book. I do not know of any similar edition in English which contains so much information in so short a space. The text exhibits no novelties—save the comparative novelty διελθωμεν which it is good to see at 296. The notes, conveniently printed below the text, aim at leaving no difficulty unnoticed. They give plenty of help with the translation, parse all forms of any difficulty, and add a good deal of by no means elementary matter on grammar, metre and philology. Lest the student find this labour tedious, he is provided with a two-page introduction to interest him in Nausicaa, and with enlivening appreciations (some are drawn from Valgimigli), as when (10) the Phaeacians show their high degree of civilization by adhering to the principle of private property, or (254) Nausicaa's 'subconscious' is explored, or (270) the Phaeacians are said to love the sea for the sea's sake, and not as pirates or traders. The indices add further information on grammar and mythology; one may note disagreement with Woodhouse's view of the story of Nausicaa.

What one chiefly misses is an introduction which, without the removal of anything from the commentary, would set forth in brief and orderly fashion the principles of grammar etc. implied, but not always fully explained, in the notes. Thus, e.g., thematic and athematic forms are frequently mentioned, but the distinction is nowhere made clear. Some other notes too seem insufficiently explicit: ἡδὴ πρό (36) is translated 'avanti giorno' (which contradicts 48) but the construction is not discussed; at 259 G. notes the position of ἄν as un-Homeric but fails to say in what respect; the note on the un-Homeric ἐπὶν (262) is not very clear, and ἐπέκειντο (19) goes unremarked. There is something wrong with the notes on αἰεὶ (42) and ἀρρύναν (70); at 138 G. notes a spondaic verse but strangely prints προχοῦσας in his text. Misprints include II. IV for III (n. on 36 *ad fin.*).

University of St. Andrews.

Athenaeus: *The Deipnosophists*. With an English translation by C. B. GULICK. In seven volumes. VI. Pp. xi+548. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS volume begins badly, with 'James Russel Lowell' and 'Codex Marcianus' in the preface; but the only harmful misprint that I have noticed is the misattachment of note d on 569c. 556b: δεσπότην is 'owner', not 'absolute monarch'. 565d: αὐτῶ means ξυρῶ. 566f: Patroclus. 568b: αὐταῖσι refers to the subject of ἀνέλαθον. d: 'The entire verse is spurious'—

or is it the quoter's prose? 577a: ἐπιφανῶς should go with σπαργήσας. 588b: 'with Epicurus openly, so that she was much in his thoughts'. 589c: ἥς καὶ ἐπὶ ῥυτίδων: 'even' is wanted, 'though' is not. 599e: ἐν πλείοσιν is 'in company' or 'in public'. 606f: βρέφος is subject, not object. 632c: εἰς is not εἴς. 635c: ψάλλω is not 'sing'. 647f: τυρὸν ἐκπίεσας καλῶς is not 'squeeze off a good-sized piece of cheese'. 651a: if with Bentley we omit ἐγώ, the rest of the verse is not 'still unmetrical'.

Dr Gulick has done another good stage towards his goal.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Pollucis *Onomasticon* . . . edidit E. BETHE. Fasciculus tertius: indices.

FOR details see C.R. LI. 157. Every owner of the new Pollux will want these copious and careful indexes, of which the chief is the work of Gunnar Andersen. They need not be further described or commended.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Blackwell's *Byzantine Hand List*. A catalogue of Byzantine authors and books on Byzantine literature, history, religion, art, archaeology, etc. Pp. viii+68. Oxford: Blackwell, 1938. Cloth, 2s. 6d.; interleaved, 3s. 6d.

THIS *Hand List* attempts for the Eastern Roman Empire very much what Nairn's *Hand List* does for the classical world, and in order to avoid overlapping in certain sections it is meant to be used with Nairn. The period which it covers is from about the beginning of the fourth century A.D. to the final collapse of the Empire in the fifteenth century. The first section (occupying nearly half the book) contains texts with commentaries and translations. The other sections are: Literature and Literary History; Dictionaries; History, Geography and Culture; Economics and Social Life; Church and Religion; Law; Art and Archaeology; Numismatics; Monasticism and Asceticism; Slaves; Constantinople; Miscellaneous; Periodicals.

The compilers are to be congratulated on a book which supplies a long-felt want. This small *Hand List* contains an amazing amount of useful information, and all who are interested in Byzantine History should possess it; the beginner will find excellent initial guidance, the more expert a convenient reference-book.

The arrangement of the sections is good in that it rightly emphasizes the importance of Constantinople and of Monasticism and Asceticism, but most of the items in the unaccountably cosmopolitan 'Miscellaneous' section could have been placed elsewhere, and the treatment of Byzantine music is perhaps unduly meagre. The *Hand List* is admittedly selective, but even so certain names ought not to be missing from the original authorities (e.g. Michael Choniates, ed. S. P. Lampros), and there are also minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies. But these are matters that it would be easy to remedy, and it would be ungracious to criticize without making it clear that Messrs. Blackwell are to be warmly thanked for their generous contribu-

tion towards the promotion of Byzantine studies. It is no easy task to compile a satisfactory select bibliography for a period of more than a thousand years, and both medievalists and others should find this *Hand List* of real value.

J. M. HUSSEY.

University of Manchester.

Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und deutsch von Hermann DIELS. Fünfte Auflage herausgegeben von Walther KRANZ. Pp. 654. Lieferungen 7-10. Berlin: Weidmann, 1937-8.

IN revising this third volume of the *Vorsokratiker* Kranz has largely been improving on his own work, since he was himself responsible for the Word-Index in the edition of 1922; and perhaps for this reason the result is more satisfactory than in volumes I and II.

The minimum change essential was to embody in the main indices the additions previously given as Nachträge, to change the page and line references (never readjusted since the edition of 1910), and to cite illustrations of word-usage from the few fresh passages included in the new edition. The performance of this task alone would have made the index volume a far more convenient instrument of research than before. But fortunately Kranz has gone further. He has carried out that Neubearbeitung which Diels promised in the preface to the third edition, and by thorough treatment of some sections (Democritus, for example) which had received scant attention for this purpose before has added a large number of new references and brought the Word-Index far nearer to completeness. The same improvement is to be found in the Namenregister and Stellenregister.

A word of congratulation is due to the printers, who have achieved in this edition a work far more readable and more pleasant to the eye than any of its predecessors.

H. C. BALDRY.

University of Cape Town.

Robert GRAVES: *Count Belisarius*. Pp. x+528; 5 maps. London etc.: Cassell, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

IN the Foreword to his novel Mr. Graves writes: 'Wherever surviving records are meagre I have been obliged to fill in the gaps of the story with fiction, but have usually had a historical equivalent in mind, so that if exactly this or that did not happen, something similar probably did.' In view of this it is disconcerting to find that even the 'surviving records' have not been followed with any degree of accuracy. Everything is subordinated to Mr Graves' own theme, which is the glorification of the general Belisarius at the expense of the Emperor Justinian and others. Both contemporary sources and modern scholarship are disregarded at will. Nevertheless, as far as the historical setting is concerned, certain general points with regard to the Roman Empire of the sixth century are admirably brought out. The need for constant military vigilance, the normality of a good

education, the continuity of the Graeco-Roman tradition—all this, together with the appropriate personnel, is vividly described, but is unfortunately vitiated by the quiet and effective consistency with which the Christian Church is unjustly blackened. Whatever other merits this book has, the historical claims of its author remain unjustified, for it gives a prejudiced picture both of its hero and of the age in which he lived.

J. M. HUSSEY.

University of Manchester.

Emanuele CESAREO: *Le orazioni nell'opera di Sallustio*. Pp. iv+112. (Published by the author at Palermo, Via Catania, N. 15.) 1938. Paper, L. 70 (abroad).

THIS essay consists of Introduction (pp. 1-20) on speeches in ancient histories; Part I (pp. 21-48) on Sallust's own speeches and the *Invective*; Parts II and III (pp. 49-77 and 79-105) on the *Catiline* and *Jugurtha* respectively; Part IV on the isolated speeches. The thesis is that Sallust follows the Thucydidean principle, shows great skill in re-elaborating genuine speeches, is fond of such rhetorical tricks as antithesis, and sometimes allows his own prejudices to intrude. Cesareo's account of Sallust's artistic motives is more valuable than the linguistic comments. There is some uncertain history (e.g. Sallust's marriage with Terentia) and constant illustration of a few beliefs (e.g. Sallust's antipathy to Cicero and the nobility).

In Part I, Cesareo first guesses that Sallust's speeches in 52 resembled those of Memmius and Marius in the *Jugurtha*. The rest of this section supports the authenticity of the *Invective*. Cesareo cites from Sallust's works parallels, of which many are unimpressive: the reasons for thinking the *Invective* genuine are not coincidences in the use of e.g. *a pueritia, facta ac dicta*. Bibliography is wanting: Kurfess is accused of missing these parallels, but no reference is given, nor is it made clear that Kurfess believes the *Invective* authentic. (See e.g. *Bursian* 1936, 252, pp. 44-49.)

The analysis of speeches in Part II is verbal. The recurrence of *spes, animus*, etc., is taken perhaps too seriously. Cesareo sees anti-Ciceronianism everywhere, finding sarcasm in Sallust's omission of Cicero's First Catilinarian Oration.

Part III shows Sallust fitting the speeches to his characters. This is interesting criticism, though there is great repetition. One's confidence collapses before the argument (p. 80) that in the speech of Micipsa (*Jug.* 10) there is 'a solemnity given to the exordium by the use of archaic terminations (*parvum* instead of the normal and regular *parum*)'. Does this mean regular in Sallust?

Finally, in Part IV there are more verbal coincidences and Sallustian characteristics and prejudices.

Several little misprints; and on p. 90, l. 25, LII should be CII.

J. A. H. WAY.

University of Glasgow.

E. K. RAND: *A Toast to Horace*. Pp. 41. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1937. Cloth, \$1 or 4s. 6d.

MR. RAND enjoys his cigar with Horace, whether at the Sorbonne, in Texas, or, as now, in the company of the Municipal Art Society of Baltimore. And Horace would certainly have enjoyed hearing Mr. Rand propose his health. This little book (rather expensive for its size) contains some ideas already familiar from two recently published collections of essays; but the author always has something new and good to say; and here, for instance, he counsels us to read our *Ars Poetica* along with Byron's *Hints from Horace*, with Shelley's preface to the *Prometheus Unbound* as a contrast. It is a jolly toast, suggesting the atmosphere of a particularly good dinner, with Horace sitting back *bene curata cute*, and listening with no embarrassment to the wise and kindly eulogy of his life-long friend.

'Flacce' sui 'bene te! iurans in verba magistri
discipulus clamat: sit bene discipulo!

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

CORSO BUSCAROLI: *Perfidum videns Venus*. L'ode III 27 di Orazio con versione ritmica ed esegesi. Pp. 76. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1937. Paper, L. 10.

THIS is a copious edition, with text, Italian verse translation, exegesis and commentary, of a single Ode of Horace, III, 27. The editor's methods will be familiar to those who have seen his *Libro di Didone*. In the exegesis, which is eclectic, he rightly stresses the *quasi scherzando* tone as pervading the whole poem, though this is not sufficient to counter the criticism that it lacks unity to an extent remarkable even in Horace (p. 25). He has read an immense amount on the subject, and suffers from a disinclination to leave anything out. Both exegesis and commentary are sown with the sack: a wealth of information, sometimes interesting and useful even where it is not strictly relevant, which he has culled from all sides, is swamped too often by needless references, lists of names, and quotations from previous writers. Thus on p. 30 the phrase *solis ab ortu*, which might surely take care of itself, has the following note: 'Per *solis ab ortu* (frase ch'è anche in Ov. *Tr.* V, 8, 25 ed *Ex P.* III, 1, 27), cfr. IV, 15, 15-6: "ad ortus solis"; *Sat.* I, 4, 29: "surgente a sole" ("dall' oriente"); Suet. *Vesp.* V: "ab solis exortu". And on p. 37 a list of fifteen people is given as having taken a certain passage in a certain way.

In a short review it is impossible to do justice to the mass of material here collected. Usually the editor shows discrimination in his decisions. But there is one important exception: like the majority of editors, he mistakes the situation in stanzas 1-4. In lines 1-12 Horace is giving his credentials as *auspex*; then we are to imagine a pause, during which Horace takes the auspices; in lines 13-16 he pronounces them favourable. (This involves reading *rumpit* with *Ρῥῦπτι* for *rumpat* in line 5, and *velat* for

velat with C and Lambinus in line 15.) This explanation, put forward by Bentley, the editor attributes to Gow and dismisses with an exclamation mark (p. 31).

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

Τὰ πρότυπα τῶν Τρωάδων τοῦ L. Annaei Senecae. Ὑπὸ Χρ. Κ. Καπνυκάγια. Pp. 142. Athens, 1936. Paper.

THIS work is an essay in literary detection. Part by part, the *Troades* is examined for clues which might help to trace τὰ πρότυπα used by Seneca in his plot, characterization, and treatment. In a short preface to each section the writer outlines his theory as to the originals which, from a similarity of subject, he believes Seneca to have imitated: evidence to support the theory is sought by combing each scene for resemblances of phraseology: and if these φραστικαὶ ὁμοιότητες abound, or can be made to abound, they are held to be proof of relationship between the presumed original and the alleged copy.

The various prefaces contain much suggestive material. But the method of proof is not convincing. For example, one may agree with Mr. Kapnukayas that in sketching the ἦθος of Talthybius the poet had in mind the herald of Euripides' *Troades* and perhaps also Aeneas' encounter with the ghost of Polydorus: but can one equally agree that τὸ πρᾶγμα θὰ γίνῃ καταφανὲς ἐκ τῆς παραβολῆς τῶν παραλλήλων στίχων? Is not the inner resemblance of thought a surer test than these often trivial resemblances of wording, many of which are purely accidental and must always occur when two writers describe the same kind of scene?

There are admittedly in the *Troades* some definite imitations of Euripides, Virgil, and Ovid: they stand there as clear and discernible as the stones of an earlier edifice built into a mediaeval church: their presence and significance have already been noted by the older commentators. Most of the *additional* parallels collected by Mr. Kapnukayas have no relation beyond a superficial verbal likeness. So I cannot accept the statement which like a refrain pervades the treatise: αἱ φραστικαὶ ὁμοιότητες εἶναι ὁ ἀνευδὴς μάρτυς τῶν λεγομένων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. I quote rather the criticism which he himself applies to another investigator: ὑπερβάλλει ἐν πολλοῖς τὰ πρᾶγματα, διαβλέπων . . . μίμησιν ἐκεῖ ὅπου δὲν ὑπάρχει. W. H. SEMPLÉ.

University of Manchester.

LADISLAUS STRZELECKI: *De Flavio Capro Nonii Auctore*. (Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego, T. LXV nr 3.) Pp. 39. Cracow: Nakładem Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności, 1936. Paper.

THIS is a model of orderly, concise and lucid argument, leading to a synthesis of existing views and a definite advance towards the solution of a perplexing problem. Lindsay realized the importance of knowing on what method Nonius' dictionary of Republican Latin was put together. If the method was constant and we

were sure of it, much light would be thrown on the text of Nonius and (far more important) on the order of the fragments from the lost Republican writers. In St. Andrews University Publications No. 1 he set out his theory that Nonius used forty-one lists of words collected from glossaries or texts of authors (the words appearing in the order in which they appeared in the pages of the several authors), and evolved each of his Books by the mechanical process of consulting his lists in the same invariable sequence. This theory (with additions) accounted for many of the facts, but not all; and it was least satisfactory for Books II, III, and IV, where Nonius is broken up into alphabetical sections. We are concerned here only with Book III, *De Indiscretis Nominibus*. Other scholars either disregarded Lindsay's view or, noting that III contained material from Caper, said that Lindsay was wrong. Strzelecki proves that both views are right. He details, and confirms, all the material which is certainly or probably from Caper. It is imposing in bulk and full of interest. It formed the basis of III (as S. has shown that other grammarians did for the other Books). Then he comes to the rescue of Lindsay's forty-one lists. They are there beyond a doubt, but sadly disordered; and the reason for the disorder is that the Caper material (which was supplemented from the lists) was not alphabetical, and, when Nonius introduced alphabetical sequence into it, the list sequence suffered. This is an inadequate summary of a very fine piece of work. With great modesty S. claims to have modified Lindsay only in details. He has done more. But no one would have been more delighted than Lindsay. It was he who first hailed S. in this journal: 'We welcome this brilliant young scholar, and expect great things from him in future'.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

Sister M. Bernard SCHIEMAN: *The Rare and Late Verbs in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei*: A Morphological and Semasiological Study. Pp. xviii+85. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2.

THE present investigation completes that begun in the forty-fourth volume of the well-known series of 'Patristic Studies', in which nouns, adjectives and adverbs in the *City of God* were discussed. It follows the general lines of the series in which it appears. The bibliography is somewhat capricious, as it includes Bayard on Cyprian, but not Watson. I suggest that the bibliography in the fifth edition of Stolz-Schmalz (pp. 347-362) should be used in such a case, and brought up to date. All that would be necessary in these volumes would be to give works that are not mentioned in Stolz-Schmalz. The verbs are classified thus: derivatives of nouns, of adjectives, of adverbs or other verbs; inceptive forms, and 'compounds'. This division is convenient, but of course the classes are not mutually exclusive. The work shows many signs of care and industry, and will be found

useful by students of the *De Civitate Dei*. But it is necessary to refer to certain signs that the old rigorous training in Latin morphology is much rarer nowadays: *fornicare* for *fornicari*, *principare* for *principari* (p. 4), *confundare* for *confundere* (p. 19), *rixare* for *rixari* (p. 38), *mutuare* for *mutuari* (p. 58). On p. 8, 'Auscon.' should be 'Ascon.' It should be noted that the dictionaries wrongly give *occanto* and *occento* (p. 37) as separate words.

A. SOUTER.

Oxford.

Harry JANSSEN: *Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian*. Pp. xii+265. (Latinitas Christianorum Primæva etc., Fasc. 8.) Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1938. Stiff paper, fl. 3.25.

THE newest part of this admirable series deals with a topic on which Teeuwen and Watson, among others, have written. But Janssen has profited by their work and is more diffuse. He starts with an excellent bibliography, and after an introduction considers in detail terms concerned with the life and government of the Church on the one hand, and with martyrs, confessors, and the conduct expected of Christians on the other. The work ends with a summary and the usual indexes. The sort of words whose history he endeavours to trace are *ecclesia*, *catechumenus*, *clerus*, *ordinare*, *laici*, *plebs*, *populus*, *episcopus*, *presbyter*, *sacerdos*, *papa*, *diaconus*, *oblatio*, *haereticus*, *schisma*, *martyr*, *passio*, *confessor*, *lapsus*, *brabium*, *agape*, *elemosyna*, *refrigerium*. His general method is to study in one section each word as used by Tertullian, and in the other as used by Cyprian. All this is done with care and insight, and the work will be found useful even by the advanced student of later Latin.

The following matters are open to criticism: P. vii: read Caecili. P. 18, n. 2: Koch is quite right; there is more evidence for the shorter form than is yet published, and no textual critic of experience could possibly think differently. P. 99, n. 1: read 'deacon'. P. 100, n. 1: read 23 and *exorcismo*. P. 123: read IN EADEM TRADITIONE PERMANEAT (confirmed by Cyprian p. 174, 4-5, which is ignored). P. 125: read *filios*. P. 126: read *arbitrantur*. P. 145, n. 1, 164, n. 2, 168, n. 1, and 197, n. 3: read 'Leclercq'. P. 148: read *testificari*. P. 154: the attribution to Aalders (!) and Von Soden of a discovery due to Hort (1881) and confirmed by Sanday (1886) may be regarded either as ignorance or as something worse. P. 197, n. 3: the edition of Harnack, *Mission*, is not specified.

A. SOUTER.

Oxford.

Heinrich DÖRRIE: *Passio SS. Machabæorum, die antike lateinische Übersetzung des IV. Makkabäerbuches*. Pp. viii+147. (Abh. d. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Ph.-H. Kl. 3. Folge, Nr. 22.) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1938. Paper.

AS a preparation for the edition of Fourth Maccabees, which is to appear in the great

Göttingen edition of the Septuagint, it has been thought well to issue a critical edition of the hitherto unpublished Latin translation. This will be very welcome to more than one class of students. The editor has obviously been well trained for his duties, in every respect but one. I refer to training in Latin grammar and orthography: *coelum* (p. 72), *connexa* (p. 88), *littora* (p. 97), *lineamentis* (p. 98), *limola* (p. 102), *comb-uret* (so divided, p. 103); *carperetur* taken from *carpio* (p. 126), *compescuit* from *compacisco* (p. 127), *discusso* from *discuto* (p. 129), *exegit* from *exago*, *excisos* from *excidio*, *expauisti* from *expauco*, *extimuit* from *extimeo*, *incussit* from *incudo*, *indoluit* from *indoleo*, *irascens* from *irasco*, *lumbis* from *lumbum*, *medullitis* from *medullio*, *proeliaturus* from *proelio*, *sirenas* from *sirena*, *subulis* from *subulus*, *uenerandus* from *uenero*. These errors are most regrettable, but I must repeat that the rest of the work is good. A wide search has been made for manuscripts, and they appear to have been carefully collated. The discussion of their interrelations is convincing, and the other parts of the introduction, dealing with the style and method of the translator, are illuminating. The history of the word *passio* is well traced. The translation is assigned to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, and was certainly unknown to Ambrose when he wrote his *De Iacob et uita beata*. The archetype of our numerous MSS is traced back to France.

A. SOUTER.
Oxford.

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Tom. IX ediderunt H. M. ALLEN et H. W. GARROD. Pp. xxiv + 497; 2 plates, 1 woodcut. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 28s.

THIS great edition is drawing to its conclusion. The ninth volume runs from 1 August, 1530 to 30 March, 1532. Erasmus is at Freiburg, but more and more restless. He first lived rent free in a house built for the Emperor Maximilian. Difficulties arose, especially with the other tenants. In September, 1531, he moved into a new house. For most of the time he was in wretched health, and carrying on a warfare on two fronts, against his Catholic and Protestant enemies. He is obsessed with the supposed malignity of Aleander towards himself, and is constantly seeking the protection of Cardinal Campegio, to whom he reiterates his determination never to leave the Church. At the same time his animus against the Reformers becomes stronger. This is shown especially in his letter to Bucer and in his contemptuous references to the deaths of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, 'two chief pillars of the sect of the Sacramentarians'. He was particularly annoyed by Julius Caesar Scaliger's *Oratio pro Cicerone contra Erasmus*, and persisted in believing that its real author was his arch-enemy. When Scaliger's second oration came out, he was dead. J. J. Scaliger admits that his father under-estimated Erasmus.

Erasmus' relations with England have now become a mere matter of £ s. d. He is still in

receipt of pensions from Warham and Mountjoy, but he says 'If anything happens to Warham, the English will not give a halfpenny.' Altogether there is too much about Erasmus' finance in this volume to make it altogether pleasant reading. He writes once to Pole, regretting the death of Lupset, and he dedicates Bebel's Aristotle to young More and Froben's Livy to young Blount. 2359 (August, 1530) is also the preface to Froben's Chrysostom, and 2611 (February, 1532) the preface to Froben's Basil. His remarks on the styles of Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil are worth reading.

The editing is, as one would expect, quite faultless, but the notes have been cut down to the barest minimum, and may we plead with the editors sometimes to give more than a reference to a previous letter? The volume is adorned by two fine Holbein portraits at Parma and Basle.

G. C. RICHARDS.

Oxford.

Gudmund BJÖRCK: *Der Fluch des Christen Sabinus*. Pp. 165; 2 folding plates. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell (Cambridge: Heffer), 1938. Paper, 6 kronor.

THIS is a good edition, with full commentary, of a very interesting sixth-century papyrus (Upsaliensis 8). It is a palimpsest, of unknown provenance, possibly Achnim; but by great good luck there is another papyrus (Hamburg 22) which contains a copy of part of its contents. The Uppsala document is partly in prose, partly in verse, and the Hamburg papyrus gives the whole verse inscription (for it seems to have been an inscription for a grave, or at least a draft of one, whether set up or not), whereof the Uppsala papyrus quotes part only. The poet speaks in the name of one Sabinus (who of course may have written his own epitaph during his last illness or at some other time) and cries for vengeance on those that have wronged him, especially his own daughter. The prose introduction tells us more of the matter; Sabinus there denounces his daughter Severina and someone named Didymos, perhaps her husband, prays that God will make of none avail the conspiring of their hearts against his, the dying man's, 'beloved children', and hopes that they will one day appear before the divine tribunal to be judged.

All this is interesting, for it tells us of a curious family quarrel some fourteen hundred years ago; but still more interesting is the fact, brought out by Björck's commentary, that Sabinus appealed to the Deity in correct legal form, as if he were petitioning a magistrate to redress some injustice. It would seem that he took his document to his grave with him, doubtless meaning to hand it to the proper authorities in the other world.

The author does his readers the further service of adding an account of other appeals for vengeance more or less resembling this, quoting many in full. He has left little or nothing unexplained in language or content of his remarkable material.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Curt SACHS: *World History of the Dance*. Translated by Bessie Schönberg. Pp. xii+469; 32 plates. London: Allen and Unwin, 1938. Cloth, 20s.

THE author has obviously been at great pains to gather material from all over the world, and the references, or such of them as the translator has left (the reader is bidden to 'consult the German edition' for more detailed information), show wide reading. He describes the various kinds of dance, savage and civilized, classifies them, relates them to the sundry types of culture to be found in the rather fanciful lists of the Schmidt-Graebner school of anthropology, explains their meaning or what he takes to be such, and gives a history of the dance in Europe from the palaeolithic period to the rumba.

Only a small portion of the book is germane to the subjects usually discussed in this journal. It is to be hoped that the rest of the work is more accurate than that part which relates to Greece and Rome, for blunders occur thickly, not only in the section (p. 237 *sqq.*) professedly describing the dances of classical antiquity, but in numerous passing mentions of them up and down the book. The most irritating fault is a blandly dogmatic way of stating doubtful or quite unfounded propositions. What authority, for instance, has Dr. Sachs for saying that a particular gesture of the fingers was borrowed by the Greeks from the Persians (p. 14)? What has Dionysos to do with gods, or other beings, who limp (p. 129)? How does he know that a priest of Kybele cried, or hummed, *hoo* while he danced (p. 175)? P. 242, besides the absurdity of calling the ritual of the Lupercalia 'infamous' (had the author perhaps confused *Lupercal* with *lupanar*?), has six lines about Dionysiac ritual which are nonsense and confusion from beginning to end. P. 244 confuses oratorical with dancing gestures; p. 245 *sqq.* treat of Roman dancing very inadequately. But perhaps these periods are the ones Dr. Sachs knows least about. H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

R. P. ECKELS: *Greek Wolf-Lore*. Pp. 88. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1937. Paper.

THE title of this doctoral dissertation is somewhat misleading, for Mr Eckels's industry extends into the Middle Ages and beyond, and, if I may judge from the section on 'The silencing gaze of wolves', is by no means exhaustive on Greek sources. That section, though learned in authorities from Hugo of St. Victor (whom he miscalls) to Sir Thomas Browne, omits half a dozen ancient references, and might have supplied some modern from notes in *Classical Weekly* xxiv *et seq.*, to which also no reference is made.

I do not think Mr Eckels solves any problems, and his accuracy is not impeccable, but the student will suck some sustenance from his pages (for instance, if you think it was Horace's singing rather than his integrity of life which scared the wolf at C. i. 22. 9, you will be glad to know of the workmen in Ontario whose whistling of *God Save the King* was similarly

efficacious), and he is likely to read with more enjoyment than dissertations usually provide a treatise which the author has visibly enjoyed writing. A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *Four Greek Vases in the Manchester Museum*. (Notes from the Manchester Museum, No. 39. Reprinted from the Memoirs of the Manch. Lit. and Phil. Soc. Vol. LXXXII, 1937-38.) Pp. 11 (9-19); 5 plates. Manchester, 1937. Paper, 6d.

PROFESSOR WEBSTER continues a useful work in publishing four more Greek vases which have recently come into the Manchester Museum. The first is an Attic Geometric cup; he lists the sixteen examples of the type known to him, and arranges them in an approximate order of date. He illustrates two examples in Edinburgh. The next piece is an Ionian perfume vase in the form of a helmeted head. He points out that it differs from most of the vases of this form in being of pale clay like the vases of the Pomegranate Group. He mentions a vase in the British Museum and another formerly in the Torr collection which go with it. The British Museum vase however is not of pale clay but of dark clay with a white slip, and I should expect the same to be true of the almost identical vase in the Torr collection. Professor Webster shows reasons for dating these three vases later than the common run of helmeted heads, perhaps in the first quarter of the sixth century. Lastly come two Attic white-ground lekythoi, one ascribed to the Rectangle Painter and dated in the thirties of the fifth century, the other dated about 430 and connected with the late work of Buschor's Charon Painter, whose possible identity with Beazley's Sabouroff Painter Professor Webster discusses. He also illustrates an earlier white-ground lekythos in the Manchester Museum, ascribed to a follower of the Sotades Painter, and dated about 460 B.C. C. M. ROBERTSON.

British Museum.

I. KOVRIG: *Die Haupttypen der kaiserzeitlichen Fibeln in Pannonien*. Pp. 132; 41 plates. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Series II, No. 4.) 1937. Budapest: Institut für Münzkunde und Archäologie (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, Pengö 25 (bound, 28).

THIS study makes an important addition to the valuable series of works on Pannonia published under the direction of Dr. A. Alföldi. To produce it Dr. Kovrig has collected and classified three thousand brooches of the Roman period found in the province. He divides them into fourteen groups. The affinity with the brooches of the neighbouring province of Noricum is strong, and the earlier ones, as might be expected, reflect the Celtic influence so prominent in Norican metalwork. Prominent among first- and second-century types is the huge Norican or Norican-Pannonian wing-fibula, with its elaborate openwork catchplate, sometimes adorned in addition with gold rosettes or semi-precious stones, which is known from tomb-

stones at Intercisa and Csákvár to have been worn on the shoulders, above which the decorated plates projected. The Aucissa type also is frequent, and the author believes that many of these were made within the province, at Sissek. Another Gaulish type, the 'thistle fibula,' seems to be rare in Pannonia, and there is a surprising lack of enamelled disc-brooches. Nor are any examples illustrated of the 'Trompeten Muster' which occurs in some quantity along the German limes. Among the later brooches Dr. Kovrig regards the much-discussed 'fibula with returned foot' as 'a product of the so-called renaissance of the Celtic style.'

The most important part of the book, the description of the various groups, is repeated in full in the twenty-seven pages of the German section. The rest of the Magyar text describes the fibulae illustrated, and their provenance, and as it contains so many place-names it is not entirely unintelligible to the foreigner. The work is copiously illustrated, having nineteen plates of more than two hundred large, clear drawings and twenty-two plates of collotypes, some of which are, unfortunately, not of the same quality as the rest of the book.

OLWEN BROGAN.

Harald FUCHS: *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*. Pp. ii + 102. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1938. Paper, RM. 5.

THE general form of this interesting work is one popular of late years on the Continent, and not without its advantages; perhaps the best-known example is Cumont's *Religions orientales*. The text is an inaugural lecture delivered at Bâle, and but 24 pages long (the lines of the pages being numbered, a kindness to the reader which is too rare); the most space is filled by rich annotations, justifying by quotation from a number of authors ancient and modern the views which the writer had set forth. His subject is sufficiently explained by the title, and he finds anti-Roman propaganda chiefly in the following forms: (1) The idea that Roman success was due to fortune, not desert (p. 1 sq.). (2) The attack, by Karneades, upon the fundamental Roman conviction of their own justice (p. 3 sqq.). Here the reviewer disagrees, seeing in Karneades' famous pair of speeches at Rome in 598/156 rather a typical utterance of a professional lecturer, defending, before an audience which he knew to have little acquaintance with philosophy, first the *κρείττων* and then the *ἥττων λόγος*. (3) The theme of the revenge of Asia, p. 7 sqq. (4) The glorification of Alexander the Great, p. 14 and elsewhere. (5) Judaeo-Christian polemic, p. 19 sqq. He also notes the occurrence in Rome itself of ideas connected with these, and cites evidence of the understanding shown by Roman writers for the feelings and arguments of their country's enemies.

There is no space to deal with the many problems raised in the notes; the reviewer agrees with Dr. Fuchs in rejecting (p. 36, note 20) Tarn's interpretation of *orac. Sibyll.*, iii, 359 as alluding to Kleopatra VII.

H. J. ROSE.
University of St. Andrews.

Fletcher PRATT: *Hail, Caesar!* Pp. 349; 10 plates. London: Williams and Norgate, 1938. Cloth, 15s.

THE surviving records of ancient history, all too often flat and schematic when they are not a mere collection of scraps, cry aloud for an imaginative reconstruction that shall have some of the unity and verisimilitude of the better sort of fiction. Mr. Pratt is certainly inventive—unnecessarily so. He describes Caesar's wife Pompeia as a 'strawberry blonde, tall and willowy'. But modern conventions of beauty are no guide to the taste of Caesar—or of P. Clodius: the lady might well have been 'nervosa et lignea' or 'magna atque immanis' (to invoke Lucretian categories). It does not matter. This is not the worst, however. We read that Caesar was an advocate of 'proletarian democracy'. A great pity, for the book has signal merits. The military history is well done—not merely movement and clear narrative but acute intelligence and a familiarity with geography. The ten plates reproduce maps in relief.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

Luisa BANTI: *Luni*. Pp. 202; 30 plates. Florence: Rinascimento del Libro. N.D. (1937). Paper.

LUNA has acquired fame from its harbour, from its Roman colony, and from the extensive quarries of Carrara marble in the vicinity. But it has scanty claim to appear in a series which is devoted to Etruscan cities and cemeteries and is published under the auspices of the *Istituto di Studi Etruschi*. Luna, as the learned lady who has written this volume so convincingly demonstrates, is Etruscan only in the geographical sense, an honour which it derives from Augustus' regional division of Italy; though the Etruscans may have held it for a time, their influence upon the native Ligurians was inconsiderable. Whatever the excuse, however, there is every reason to be grateful for this thorough and scientific study of Luna and its vicinity from the Palaeolithic Age to the Roman period.

Of Roman Luna (founded in 177 B.C.) the walls may still be traced, but little else survives, so the author may perhaps be pardoned for her extreme brevity in this section. As for the harbour, she maintains that the 'Lunae portus' mentioned by ancient writers is not the whole expanse of the Gulf of Spezzia, as many, following Strabo, have assumed, but only the harbour of the colony itself, near the mouth of the river Magra. The strong point of the book, however, is purely archaeological: it forms an introduction to the whole question of the pre-history of the Ligurian population behind the Gulf of Spezzia, and provides a full and accurate gazetteer of all sites and all finds. Among objects of note are the curious *stelae*, roughly fashioned into the shape of a standing human figure (Bronze and Iron Ages): the author suggests that they are not gravestones but cult-images.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

G. J. ACHESON: *Agricola*. An English Version of a Roman Tale. Pp. 100. London: Macmillan, 1938. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE *Agricola*, being an account of the training and career of a member of the governing class, is well suited to be read as a text in schools; nor is a translation entirely to be spurned. This neat and well-printed volume gives a version that is, on the whole, pleasant and acceptable, though often making one long for the concentrated vigour of the original. Thus, in the description of Agricola's education (c. 4, 4) we read 'he was inclined too readily to absorb philosophical lore more extensively than was considered permissible in a Roman citizen destined to attain senatorial rank' as a rendering of 'studium philosophiae acrius, ultraque quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse.'

There is no indication of the text followed. 'Territorial regiments' as a term for permanent units of the Roman *auxilia* is misleading. English lacks the freedom of Latin in varying the order of a man's names. One would like to be able to write 'Massa Baebius' and 'Priscus Helvidius': Mr. Acheson does.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

Sterling Dow: *Prytaneis, A Study of the Inscriptions honoring the Athenian Councilors*. (*Hesperia*, Supplement I.) Pp. iv+258, with 101 photographs and 2 line-drawings. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1937. Paper, \$3.

ONE of the foremost living epigraphists, Professor L. Robert, has recently put forward a plea (*Rev. Phil.* viii. 407) for more departmental *corpora*—complete collections of Greek inscriptions of the same category or type, with carefully established texts, adequate commentaries and full indexes—and has suggested a number of fields in which such *corpora* are urgent desiderata of ancient studies. It would be hard to imagine a better illustration of the form which such collections should take and of the value they possess than that afforded by this volume, in which a scholar who, though still young, has already published a remarkable amount of epigraphical work of first-rate quality, collects, re-edits and discusses all the extant Athenian decrees in honour of *prytaneis*, which 'constitute the longest series of homogeneous public decrees from any Greek city'. These range from 327-6 B.C. to the second century of our era, though the third and second centuries B.C. claim almost four-fifths of the total number. Of the 121 documents in question, sixty-two are wholly new, part of the fruits of the American excavations in the Athenian Agora, while to seven others new fragments are added. All the new texts receive an admirable *editio princeps*, while those already included in *I.G.* II² or in *Hesperia* are listed, annotated and even indexed, but are not normally republished in full. To this collection an introduction (pp. 1-30) is prefixed, briefly and lucidly discussing the main questions relative to this group of decrees and summarizing the results of the author's research, while an appendix (pp. 198-215) describes and illustrates

the surviving fragments of Athenian allotment-machines (*κληρομήτρα*). The work closes with the ample indexes postulated by Robert.

The book is exemplary alike in form and in the care with which the author has executed his task, and it reflects the highest credit alike on him and on American scholarship; the exceedingly few slips which I have noted (e.g. *ἐπεφύλαξεν* on p. 38 and *μεγαλόμερος* on p. 256) are unlikely to deceive any careful reader and are not worth registering here.

MARCUS N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

W. A. A. VAN OTTERLO: *Beschouwingen over het archaische element in den stijl van Aeschylus*. Pp. 162. Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon, 1937. Paper.

INSPIRED by van Groningen (*C.R.* LI. 174) and largely indebted to H. Fränkel and F. Dornseiff, this doctoral thesis begins by explaining and illustrating the 'paratactic' style, of which Pindar is the last representative in verse and Herodotus in prose. Aeschylus exhibits the transition from this pre-classical to the classical technique. As compared with Sophocles and Euripides he is more given to the *λέξις εἰρημένη*, where 'the sentences are simply strung together, their exact relations being left to the understanding' (Verrall); and to various associated peculiarities, including the 'copulative comparison' (of which there are at least a dozen fairly clear examples in Aeschylus and only one in Sophocles, *Ant.* 473 ff.), the 'Priamel', 'Ringkomposition' (Wilamowitz's 'Umräumung durch Wiederholung', though at times one may doubt whether the repetitions are due to an artistic purpose), and certain grammatical laxities, such as abrupt transitions from indirect to direct speech (from one of which, at *Sept.* 1007, van Otterlo draws an argument for the authenticity of the last scene of that play). The author has done a useful work in carefully sorting out such features of Aeschylus' style. The study of them goes to show that there is often no need to athetize (e.g. *Sup.* 417) or to emend (e.g. *Eum.* 685). It also provides a defence of the authenticity of the *Prometheus*, which van Otterlo dates as not later than 460, chiefly because its interest in geography seems to point to a not very far advanced stage of Athenian political expansion. As a rule the author is laudably free from excess of zeal, though one may well refuse to find an 'archaic' looseness in so common and classical a construction as a *μὲν*-clause subordinate in sense to its *δέ*-clause. This is one of a few instances ('paratactic sentence-connection' is another) where the comparison with later usage seems insufficiently worked out. There is a German summary, but those who are disposed (like the reviewer) to groan under the heritage of Babel had better be warned that the interest of this work lies chiefly in its excellent discussion of details, to which neither a summary nor a review can do justice.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE notice of the *Algemeene Gids* of the Allard Pierson Museum (C.R. LII. 87) omitted to mention the name of Professor C. W. Lunsingh

Scheurleer, who was primarily responsible for the production of the work, and to whom the credit for it is mainly due.

CORRESPONDENCE

PEIRITHOOS OR APOLLO?

MR. ASHMOLE says (C.R. LII. 87): 'If Dornseiff can explain away this single point' it will be all right. He means that the famous middle figure in the west pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia cannot be Peirithoos although it is according to Pausanias, because if he did not defend his wife against the Centaur it would be not only 'a lack of chivalry' but even 'a lack of manhood'. Well, I too have felt this difficulty, and in the second edition of my paper¹ I had already changed my interpretation of the situation represented. According to Homer, whose story was the basis for Alka-

menes as Pausanias says, the conflict with the Centaurs at the wedding-feast was an incident beginning a war of one year, at the end of which the Lapiths won. This was known to every Greek by his reading of Homer at school. Therefore in this trouble arising at his wedding Peirithoos is not primarily hero and eager husband, but king and commander-in-chief of his Lapiths in a moment of great political importance. He starts a war in a majestic attitude, and with the grand gesture of his right hand he gives an order to his paladin Kaineus: 'Here, attack Eurytion'; and to all his men: 'Throw them out'. The question of the bow in the left hand is dealt with on pp. 27 f. of my paper.

FRANZ DORNSEIFF.

University of Greifswald.

¹ See C.R. LII. 158.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to C.R. denotes a review or mention in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON XIV. 8. AUGUST 1938.

S. Reiter: *Friedrich August Wolf. Ein Leben in Briefen*. 3 vols. [Stuttgart: Metzler, 1935] (Pfeiffer). An illuminating collection of letters. H. Moeller: *Untersuchungen zum 'Desmotes' des Aischylos* [C.R. LI. 169] (Peretti). M. has much to say that is interesting, but the ethical and religious problem of the Desmotes is not solved. M. Untersteiner: (1) *Sofocle. Studio critico* [C.R. L. 68]; (2) *Sofocle. Aiace. Introduzione e commento* [C.R. XLIX. 64] (Lesky). (1) U. is learned and intelligent, but his interpretations are too subtle. (2) An interesting and stimulating commentary. H. Weinstock: *Sophokles*. 2nd edition [Berlin: Die Runde, 1937. Pp. 221] (Nestle). A book which must be taken into account although not always convincing. A. Svensson: *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik* [C.R. LI. 201] (Wyss). Useful; but S. should have considered grammatical theory of the time. J. Svennung: *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volksprache* [C.R. LI. 19] (Hoppe). A monumental work which would have been better had it been more consistently relevant. *Consentii ars de barbarismis et metaplasms. Victorini fragmentum de soloecismo et barbarismo*. Rec. M. Niedermann [Neuchâtel, 1937. Pp. 1+43] (Leumann). This short treatise has an intrinsic interest which justifies the labour that N. has spent in re-editing it. (R. Naumann

describes recent excavations in Syria at Qasr el Heir el-Gharbi and Kal' at Sem'an.) S. Aurigemma: *Il R. Museo di Spina in Ferrara*. 2nd edition, 1936. Pp. 333, 136 plates (Brommer). A useful catalogue, of which the second edition should have profited by Beazley's review of the first (J.H.S. 56, 88 ff.). I. Kovrig: *Die Haupttypen der kaiserzeitlichen Fibeln in Pannonien* [C.R. LII. 202] (Zeiss). Z. welcomes a preliminary survey of a little explored field. E. Schultze: *Meeresschnecke und seelüchtige Völker* [Stuttgart: Enke, 1937. Pp. xi + 191] (Miltner). An able and suggestive treatment of a complicated subject. W. Schubart: *Verfassung und Verwaltung des Ptolemäerreicht* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1937. Pp. 39] (Passerini). A remarkable achievement. C. Diehl: *Théodora, impératrice de Byzance* [Paris: de Boccard, 1937. Pp. 314] (Ensslin). An unaltered reprint of the edition of 1904.—Bibliographical Supplement 1938 No. 4 (down to July 31).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JULY—AUGUST, 1938. Nos. 27-36.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—F. Stoessl, *Die Trilogie des Aischylos. Formengesetze und Wege der Rekonstruktion* [C.R. LI. 169] (A. Lesky). S. exaggerates somewhat the theory of parallelism between the first two members of a trilogy.—G. Busch, *Untersuchungen zum Wesen der Τύχη in den Tragödien des Euripides* [C.R.

LII. 12] (H. Färber). A thorough investigation.—*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* V 4, 1. 1: *Galenus De propriis animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione; De animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione; De atra bile* ed. W. de Boer [C.R. LI. 158] (F. E. Kind). K. commends, and discusses some readings.—*Onasandri Strategicus*. Ed. E. Korzenszky et R. Vári [=Sylloge tactorum Graecorum I 1. Budapest, 1935. Pp. ix+109] (F. Lammert). Careful, sometimes rather conjectural text with full apparatus.—E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Vol. I. Ed. altera* [C.R. LI. 13] (A. Lesky). Much new material has been added and the whole volume is a masterpiece of cautious, scientific treatment.—*Satyrographorum Graecorum reliquiae*. Collegit V. Steffen [C.R. LII. 160] (E. Kalinka). A successful edition containing a very full 'satyricae dictionis index'.—K. I. Vourveris, *Platon und die Barbaren* [Athens, 1938. Pp. 24]—*Αἱ ἱστορικαὶ γνώσεις τοῦ Πλάτωνος*. A. Βαββαρικό [Athens, 1938. Pp. 160] (W. Nestle). Favourable reviews of both works. The commentary in the second is particularly full.—E. Ahrens, *Gnomon in griechischer Dichtung* (Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus) [Halle, 1937. Pp. 158] (L. Früchtel). F. finds much to criticize and would prefer a less formal treatment.

LATIN LITERATURE.—N. Loewenstein Drabkin, *The Medea exul of Ennius* [C.R. LII. 147] (A. Klotz). No new results but industrious compilation and intelligent criticism.—A. Rini, *Petronius in Italy* [C.R. LII. 24] (R. Helm). An excellent review of practically all work on P.—Chr. C. Kapnucias, *Miscellanea Horatiana* [Πανεπιστήμιον Ἀθηνῶν, 1935-36, 162-6] (R. Helm). Stresses a possible relation between Sat. I 3, 103 f. and Plat. Protag. 322a.—*Pervigilium Veneris*, edited by Sir Cecil Clementi [C.R. LI. 138] (R. Helm). Establishes the importance of the Vienna codex and offers complete review of all work done on the poem.—W. Schulze, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart der Tragödien Senecas* [Halle, 1937. Pp. 57] (K. Holl). S. defends the originality of Sen. but forgets that there may be sources other than Greek classical drama.—A. Specka, *Der hohe Stil der Dichtungen Senecas und Lucans* [C.R. LI. 208] (K. Holl). In his comparison of the two poets S. hardly succeeds, but many of his individual criticisms are good.—*Tibullus* ed. F. W. Lenz [C.R. LII. 130] (R. Helm). Careful and critical edition like the previous one, with an extended preface. H. adds notes on numerous passages.—F. della Corte, *La filologia Latina dalle origini a Varrone* [C.R. LI. 158] (A. Klotz). A clear picture in which only details need correction.—O. E. Nybakken, *An analytical study of Horace's ideas* [C.R. LI. 208] (R. Helm). Useful for those who wish to have H.'s ideas alphabetically arranged with full quotation.—M. Plezia, *De Ciceronis Academicis dissertationes tres* [Lwow, 1937. Pp. 65] (R. Philippson). Worthy of commendation although P. has not discovered much that is new.—*M. Manilii Astronomicum libri quinque*. Rec. A. E. Housman. Ed. altera [C.R. LII. 48] (A. Kraemer). Photographic reprint without important alterations.

LANGUAGE.—I. Smereka, *Studia Euripidea* II 1. *De elocutionis Euripidae consuetudinibus* [Lwow, 1937. Pp. 280] (W. Morel). S.'s statistics are untrustworthy because he lacks understanding of the Greek text.—G. Kurmulis, *Περὶ τοῦ ἐριμίου τῆς λέξεως Χαννία* [Athens, 1937. Pp. vi+53] (G. Soyter). Not quite convincing derivation from *χαννίον*, diminutive of *χάννος*.—E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Band I: Laut- und Wortlehre. II. Teil: Flexionslehre. 2. Aufl. [C.R. LII. 149] (F. Billel). A standard work for every interpreter of Hellenistic texts.

NEW TESTAMENT.—*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* hrsg. von G. Kittel. 3. Band. Lieferung 1-9 (Θαυμάρι-καλύπτω) [Stuttgart, 1935-36] (E. Nestle). Classical scholars will find in the new volume much to interest them.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANTIQUITIES.—*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, United States of America*. Fasc. 6. 2. By D. M. Robinson [C.R. LII. 150]—*Belgique*. Fasc. 2. Par F. Mayence et V. Verhoogen [Brussels, 1937] (A. Greifenhagen). In the American volume there are fifty-one excellent photographic reproductions of Attic red-figured vases with full commentary. The Belgian volume contains mainly Attic black-figured, Attic and Italic red-figured vases, illustrated (sometimes insufficiently) with descriptive text.—*The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. XVI. for 1935-36. Ed. M. Burrows and E. A. Speiser [New Haven, 1936. Pp. xi+168] (P. Thomsen). Valuable transliteration by R. H. Pfeiffer and English translation by S. of 100 cuneiform inscriptions from Nuzi.—G. Daux, *Pausanias à Delphes* [Paris. Pp. 203, with 6 illustrations and 9 photographic plates] (G. Lippold). By comparing the text with the results of excavation D. renews in general our confidence in P.'s reliability.—H. Brünsting, *Hel graefveld onder Hees bij Nijmegen* [C.R. LII. 78] (E. Gerster). Good account of Roman remains dating from A.D. 70 to A.D. 240.—A. D. Trendall, *Paestan Pottery* [Rome, 1936. Pp. xiv+141, with many illustrations] (G. Lippold). Clear discussion and excellent illustration.—G. Steindorff, *Aniba I, II*. Mit Beiträgen von R. Heidenreich, F. Kretschmar, A. Langsdorff, D. Marcks, H. Schleif, W. Wolf [Mission archéologique de Nubie 19, 29-34. Glückstadt, 1935] (Fr. W. Frhr. v. Bissing). This complete review of the excavations deserves our gratitude.

HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY.—E. Wikén, *Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr.* [C.R. LII. 31] (Th. Lenschau). Mainly geographical, but indispensable to every student of the history of Magna Graecia and early Rome.—H. R. Graf, *Kaiser Vespasian* [C.R. LI. 195] (H. Volkmann). Useful, although G. is apt to confuse possibilities with certainties.—H. Berve, *Geschichte der Hellenen und Römer* [Leipzig, 1936. Pp. 28] (Th. Lenschau). A serviceable outline for teachers.—A. Diller, *Race mixture among the Greeks before Alexander* [C.R. LII. 32] (Th. Lenschau). A valuable contribution,

although L. makes some reservations.—J. Kroy-mann, *Sparta und Messenien. Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferung der messenischen Kriege* [C.R. LII. 28] (F. Taeger). Important discussion of the problem of Rhianos.—W. Schubart, *Verfassung und Verwaltung des Ptolemäerreichs* [Leipzig, 1937] (H. Volkmann). An excellent introduction to the subject.—C. Metz, *Die römische Fernstrasse und das römische Strassennetz bei Wetzlar* [Wetzlar, 1937. Pp. 39, with 11 illustrations] (E. Gerster). M.'s conclusions are prejudiced and unconvincing.—A. W. Gomme, *Essays in Greek History and Literature* [C.R. LI. 234] (Th. Lenschau). Along with some material previously published there are new essays on Thucydides, the End of the Greek City-State, and Menander. L. comments favourably. C. A. Maschi, *Disertiones, Ricerche intorno alla divisibilità del consortium nel diritto romano antico* [Milan, 1935. Pp. vi.+59] (B. Kübler). K. commends, although not convinced by the conclusion drawn from the assumed equivalence of *disertio* with *disortio*.

MISCELLANEOUS.—D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* [C.R. LI. 131] (J.

Brands). Important not merely for classical scholarship but also for folklore and ornithology.—H. Bauer, *Der Ursprung des Alphabets* [Leipzig, 1937. Pp. 45, with 16 illustrations] (E. Hermann). H. expresses gratitude for the posthumous publication of this work from an outstanding authority but finds some of its conclusions unconvincing.—C. del Grande, *Elementi di metrica latina e cenni di ritmica greca* [Naples, 1936. Pp. 123] (A. Klotz). Useful but contains a number of false quantities.—W. Schubart, *Die religiöse Haltung des frühen Hellenismus* [Leipzig, 1937. Pp. 28] (E. Marbach). Sets many details in a new light.

COMMUNICATIONS.—July 2, L. Früchtel, *Neue Quellenachweise zu Isidorus von Pelusion* (2 pp.).—July 16, A. Kurfess, *Hat Linkomies' Auffassung der vierten Ekloge wirklich dem Rätselraten eine Ende bereitet?* (2 pp.).—July 23, A. v. Gerkan, *Die Fundschicht am Stadion von Olympia* (2 cols.).—July 30, C. Fries, *Zum homerischen Hermes hymnos* (1 col.).—Aug. 6, A. Fridrichsen, *Συμφυγος = ὄλη τῇ ψυχῇ* (1½ cols.).—Aug. 20, A. Kurfess, *Zu Vergil, Buc. IV 28* (1 col.).—Aug. 27, J. K. Schönberger, *Ad poetas Romanos* (2 cols.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Anderson (J. G. C.) *Cornelii Taciti De origine et situ Germanorum*. Edited by J. G. C. A. Pp. lxiv+230: 28 figures, 2 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

Arpe (C.) *Das τι ἦν εἶναι bei Aristoteles*. Pp. 58. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter und Co., 1938. Paper, RM. 3.

Bachofen (J. J.) *Du règne de la mère au patriarcat*. Pages choisies par A. Turel. Pp. 165. Paris: Alcan, 1938. Paper, 30 fr.

Barlow (E. S.) *The Trachiniae of Sophocles translated into English verse*. With a preface by T. B. L. Webster. Pp. 47. Manchester: University Press, 1938. Paper, 1s.

Beasley (J. D.) *Attic White Lekythoi*. Pp. xxvi; 8 plates. (The William Henry Charlton Memorial Lecture, November, 1937.) London: Milford, 1938. Paper, 4s.

Becker-Freyseng (A.) *Die Vorgeschichte des philosophischen Terminus 'contingens'. Die Bedeutungen von 'contingere' bei Boethius u. ihr Verhältnis zu den Aristotelischen Möglichkeitsbegriffen*. Pp. 79. (Quellen u. Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums u. des Mittelalters, Heft 7.) Heidelberg: F. Bilabel (Werderstrasse 32), 1938. Paper.

Bender (G. F.) *Der Begriff des Staatsmannes bei Thukydides*. Pp. iv+115. Würzburg: Tritsch, 1938. Paper, RM. 4.

Bowra (C. M.) *Early Greek Elegists*. Pp. viii +208. London: Oxford University Press, 1938. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

Cameron (A.) *The Pythagorean Background of the Theory of Recollection*. Pp. viii+101. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1938. Paper.

Carmina Certaminis Poetici Hoeufftiani. Pp. 16+15+19+8. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica, 1938. Paper.

Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LV. *The Latinity of the De Vita Contemplativa of Julianus Pomerius*. By M. A. C. Prendergast. Pp. xvii+185. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2.

Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LVI. *The Coordinating Particles in Saints Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine*. By J. H. Gillis. Pp. xx+237. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1938. Paper, \$2.

Charles (J. F.) *Statutes of Limitations at Athens*. Pp. iv+74. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1938. Paper.

della Corte (F.) *La poesia di Varrone Reatino ricostituita*. Pp. 102. (Estratto dalle Memorie della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Ser. 2^a, T. 69, Parte II.) Turin: R. Accademia delle Scienze, 1938. Paper.

Dioniso. *Bollettino dell' Istituto Nazionale del Drama Antico*. Vol. VI—n. 6. Syracuse, 1938. L. 5.

Evelyn (F. A.) *Caesar's Household (a Tragedy)*.

- Pp. 74. London: Heath Cranton, 1938. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Ewbank* (W. W.) Second Year Latin. Pp. x + 321; illustrations. London etc.: Longmans, 1938. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Frank* (T.) An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Edited by T. F. Vol. IV. Roman Africa—R. M. Haywood. Roman Syria—F. M. Heichelheim. Roman Greece—J. A. O. Larsen. Roman Asia—T. R. S. Broughton. Pp. vii + 950. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.
- Gerhard* (G. A.) Griechische Papyri. Urkunden und Literarische Texte aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg. Pp. x + 76; 3 plates. (Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen, Heft 6.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1938. Paper, RM. 7.80.
- Henry* (R. M.) Virgil and the Roman Epic. Pp. 24. Manchester: University Press, 1938. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Heraeus* (W.) Kleine Schriften, zum 75. Geburtstag . . . ausgewählt und herausgegeben von J. B. Hofmann. Pp. xvi + 267. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, III. Abt., 17.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, M. 19.50 (bound, 22).
- Hesperia*. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. VII: No. 3. Pp. 311-480; figures and plates. Athens: American School of Classical Studies, 1938. Paper.
- Hess* (H.) Textkritische und erklärende Beiträge zum Epitaphios des Hypereides. Pp. 115. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1938. Paper, RM. 4.50.
- Hickman* (R. M.) Ghostly Etiquette on the Classical Stage. Pp. 226. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. VII.) Cedar Rapids, Iowa: The Torch Press, 1938. Paper, \$3 (cloth, 4).
- Hoogland* (J. Ph.) Longinus 'over het Verhevene'. Vertaling met Inleiding en Opmerkingen. Pp. viii + 166. Groningen: de Waal, 1936. Paper.
- Hubert* (C.) Plutarchi Moralia. Vol. IV. Recensuit et emendavit C. H. Pp. xxvi + 405. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1938. Cloth, (export price) RM. 11.10.
- Johnson* (I.) Index criticus verborum Daretis Phrygii. Pp. vi + 119. Vanderbilt University, 1938. On sale at Peabody College Book Store, Nashville, Tennessee, U.S.A. Paper, \$1.
- Koerte* (A.) Menandri reliquiae. Pars prior: Reliquiae in papyris et membranis vetustissimis servatae. Tertium edidit A. K. Pp. lxxviii + 150. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1938. Cloth, (export price) RM. 5.70.
- Kuiper* (W. E. J.) Two Comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus: Terence's Hecyra and Phormio. Pp. vii + 101. Leyden: Brill, 1938. Paper, 2.50 guilders.
- Lewis* (L. W. P.) and *Goddard* (E. H.) Proses from Foundations for Latin Prose Composition. London: Heinemann, 1938. Limp cloth, 1s.
- McDermott* (W. C.) The Ape in Antiquity. Pp. xi + 338; 10 plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 27.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1938. Cloth, 22s. 6d.
- Mihădescu* (H.) Dioscoride Latino. Materia Medica. Libro primo. A cura di H. M. Pp. viii + 72. Jassy: printed by A. A. Terek, 1938. Paper.
- Molt* (M.) Ad Apulei Madaurensis Metamorphoseon librum primum commentarius exegeticus. Pp. xxiv + 122. Groningen: de Waal, 1938. Paper.
- Müri* (W.) Der Arzt im Altertum. Griechische und lateinische Quellentstücke mit Uebersetzung. Pp. 215. Munich: Heimeran, 1938. Paper, RM. 4.50 (bound, 5.50).
- Otto* (W.) Handbuch der Archäologie. Zweite Lieferung. Pp. xvi, 239-642: plates 37-112. Munich: Beck. Paper, (export price) RM. 20.25.
- Paoli* (U. E.) Per una futura edizione delle Maccheronèe del Folengo. Pp. 40. (Estratto dal Giornale storico della letteratura italiana—Vol. CXII.) Turin: Chiantore, 1938. Paper.
- Powell* (J. E.) Greek in the University. An Inaugural Lecture. Pp. 14. London: Milford, 1938. Paper, 1s.
- Ræder* (H.) Platons Epinomis. Pp. 40. (Det Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selsk., Hist.-fil. Medd., XXVI, 1.) Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1938. Paper, Kr. 2.75.
- Rostovtzeff* (M.) Dura-Europos and its Art. Pp. xiv + 162; 13 text figures, 28 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Cloth, 15s.
- Schmekel* (A.) Die positive Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Erster Band: Forschungen zur Philosophie des Hellenismus. Pp. viii + 677. Berlin: Weidmann, 1938. Paper, RM. 18 (bound, 24).
- Snell* (B.) Leben und Meinungen der Sieben Weisen. Griechische und lateinische Quellen aus 2000 Jahren mit der deutschen Uebersetzung. Pp. 181. Munich: Heimeran, 1938. Paper, RM. 3.20 (bound, 4).
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vol. VIII. Fasc. II. Pp. 65-184. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1938. Paper, fl. 8.
- Thomson* (G.) The Oresteia of Aeschylus. Edited with Introduction, Translation, and a Commentary in which is included the work of the late Walter G. Headlam. In two volumes. Pp. xiv + 353, 404. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 25s. each.
- Vogliano* (A.) Papiri della R. Università di Milano. Vol. I. Pp. xxiii + 277; 3 plates. Milan: Hoepli, 1937. Cloth.
- Wainwright* (G. A.) The Sky-religion in Egypt. Pp. xvi + 121; 2 plates, 5 text figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1938. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Woodhouse* (W. J.) Solon the Liberator. A study of the agrarian problem in Attika in the seventh century. Pp. xvii + 218. London: Milford, 1938. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Woolner* (A. C.) Languages in History and Politics. Pp. xiii + 167. London: Oxford University Press. Cloth, 10s. 6d.